DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 871 FL 020 563

AUTHOR	Moore, Sarah Jane; And Others
TITLE	Introducing Chinese into High Schools: The Dodge Initiative.
INSTITUTION	Johns Hopkins Univ., Washington, DC. National Foreign Language Center.
REPORT NO	ISBN-1-880671-01-8
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	149p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Foreign Language Center at the Johns Hopkins University, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 ($7.50).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Chinese; Curriculum Design; Educational Policy; High Schools; *Language Enrollment; National Surveys; *Private Financial Support; Program Development; Research Methodology; Secondary Education; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs; Student Characteristics; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Geraldine R Dodge Foundation

ABSTRACT

A study investigated results of the 1982 Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation initiative to expand teaching of Chinese in high schools. The approach taken was to examine the entire range of elements in the Dodge initiative at 55 schools where projects were funded, drawing from questionnaires, site visits, and interviews. Additional, different questionnaires were sent to 105 schools with Chinese programs not under Dodge funding and to college Chinese professors. The report offers background information on the Dodge program, an overview of the study's design, and extensive summaries of results concerning school and program characteristics, teachers, content of instruction, teaching practices and resources, and student characteristics and attitudes. Findings and recommendations are also reported. It was found that the Dodge strategy included spreading funding broadly across the country, selecting schools with records of high academic achievement, insisting on formal commitment and an approved action plan, supporting development of a new text, organizing summer teacher workshops, and importing native speakers. Recommendations for program emulation and general Chinese language teaching policy issues are noted. Appended materials include an essay on the difficulty of Chinese, a list of states with teacher training programs in Chinese, and 1991 public and private high school enrollments in Chinese. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED348871

Introducing Chinese into High Schools: The Dodge Initiative

Sarah Jane Moore

with

A. Ronald Walton

Richard D. Lambert

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard
Lambert
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

National Foreign Language Center

Monograph Series

FL020563

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introducing Chinese into High Schools:
The Dodge Initiative

by

Sarah Jane Moore

with

A. Ronald Walton
Richard D. Lambert

National Foreign Language Center

Copyright ©1992 by the National Foreign Language Center.

All rights reserved.

Moore, Sarah Jane.
Introducing Chinese into high schools : the Dodge initiative / by Sarah Jane Moore, with A. Ronald Walton, Richard D. Lambert.
p. cm.—(National Foreign Language Center monograph series)
ISBN 1-880671-01-8 : $7.50
1. Chinese language—Study and teaching (Secondary)—United States. 2. Educational surveys—United States. I. Walton, A. Ronald. II. Lambert, Richard D. III. Title. IV. Series: Monograph series (Johns Hopkins University, National Foreign Language Center)
PL1068.U5M66 1992
495.1'8'0071273—dc20
92-22137
CIP

For more information, please write:
The National Foreign Language Center
at the Johns Hopkins University
1619 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036

Contents

List of Tables v
Foreword ix
Preface xi
Acknowledgments xv

1 Overview 1
2 Schools and Programs 15
3 Teachers 35
4 The Content of Instruction 51
5 Teaching Practices and Resources 73
6 Students 89
7 Summary and Recommendations 117

Appendix A The Difficulty of Chinese 127
Appendix B States with Teacher Training Programs in Chinese 131
Appendix C Public and Private High Schools Offering Chinese in 1991 . . . 133

Tables

1.1: Enrollments in Chinese in American Public Schools, 1962–90 5
1.2: List of Dodge Grantees, Indicating Questionnaire Returns and Site Visits . . 11

2.1: Allocation of Dodge Funds, by Category 20
2.2: Size of Dodge Grants 20
2.3: Schools' Utilization of Dodge Funds, by Category 21
2.4: Allocation of Funds by Expenditure Category 22
2.5: Security of Chinese Programs as Projected by Principals 23
2.6: Importance of Components of Successful Programs as Rated by Dodge-School Principals 24
2.7: Reasons Non-Dodge Schools Discontinued Chinese 24
2.8: Mean Foreign Language Enrollments, by Level 26
2.9: Supportiveness of Various Sources of Support as Rated by Teachers 28
2.10: Parental Role from the Teachers' Perspective 31
2.11: Parental Role from the Principals' Perspective 32
2.12: Parental Level of Support from the Principals' Perspective 32
2.13: Schools Offering Nonlanguage Courses on China 33

3.1: Age of High School Chinese Teachers and High School Teachers Generally 36
3.2: Gender of High School Chinese Teachers, Other High School Language Teachers, and High School Teachers Generally 36
3.3: Ethnicity of Dodge and Non-Dodge High School Chinese Language Teachers 37
3.4: Educational Background of High School Chinese Language Teachers . . . 39
3.5: Highest Level of Education Attained Prior to Migration of Native-Speaker Teachers of Chinese 40
3.6: Non-native Speakers' Evaluations of Their Chinese Language Abilities . . . 42
3.7: Teachers' Experience in Various Educational Situations 43
3.8: Percentage of Teachers Having Worked at Various Educational Levels . . . 44
3.9: Percentage of Teachers Having Worked in Multiple Settings 45
3.10: Mean Utility of Teacher Workshops 46
3.11: Mean Utility of Activities at Past Workshops and Desired Emphasis for Future Ones 46
3.12: Distribution of Teachers by Type of Employment Contract 47

3.13: Certification of Chinese Language Teachers in Dodge and Non-Dodge Schools and of Other Foreign Language Teachers 49
3.14: Distribution of Secondary Subjects Taught by Chinese Teachers 50

4.1: Mean Emphasis Placed on Each Skill at Each Level of Chinese Instruction . . 53
4.2: Percentage of Teachers Using Simplified or Traditional Chinese Character System 58
4.3: Mean Number of Characters Students Are Expected to Recognize and Produce 59
4.4: Range of Characters Taught 59
4.5: Percentage of Teachers Using Each Transcription System 63
4.6: Percentage of Teachers Expecting Specific Structural Patterns to Be Mastered at Various Levels 66
4.7: Percentage of Classroom Time Devoted to Cultural Instruction 68
4.8: Frequency with Which Teachers Use Various Methods of Providing Cultural Instruction 68

5.1: Percentage of Classroom Time Spent Utilizing Chinese as the Medium of Instruction 74
5.2: Percentage of Teachers Assigning Various Homework Activities 75
5.3: Mean Number of Minutes Teachers Expect Students to Spend per Week on Various Homework Activities 75
5.4: Average Number of Hours Teachers Spend per Week on Various Responsibilities 78
5.5: Number of Teachers Using Particular Textbooks, by Level 81
5.6: Percentage of Teachers Using Dodge Materials in the Classroom 83
5.7: Teachers' Satisfaction with ***The Chinese Primer*** Materials 83
5.8: Adequacy of Various Aspects of ***The Chinese Primer*** as Perceived by Teachers Using It 84
5.9: Percentage of Teachers Completing Various Numbers of Units in ***The Chinese Primer,*** by Level 85
5.10: Percentage of Teachers Reporting Availability and Use of Various Technical Resources 86

6.1: Distribution of Students by Class and Course Level 98
6.2: Year-to-Year Enrollment Attrition, by Cause 99
6.3: Overall Student Attrition, by Cause 99
6.4: Percentage of Students Continuing Chinese, When Continuation Is Possible 100
6.5: Percentage of Students Completing One to Four Years of High School Chinese 100
6.6: Selectivity of College Choices of High School Students 103
6.7: Distribution of Intended Majors 104
6.8: Percentage of Students Planning to Continue Studying Chinese, by Intended Major 105
6.9: Career Choices of High School Students 106

6.10: Percentage of High School Students Expecting to Use Their Chinese Professionally, by Career 107
6.11: Level of First Chinese Course in College 109
6.12: Areas of Difficulty in the Transition from High School to College as Reported by Graduates of High School Chinese Programs and Teachers . . 110
6.13: Length of College Study Planned by Those Taking Chinese 111
6.14: Career Choices of High School and College Students 113
6.15: College Students' Expectations of Using Their Chinese Professionally, by Career 113
6.16: Percentage of College Students Expecting to Use Their Chinese Professionally, by Career 114

Foreword

This survey of an experiment in the introduction of Chinese into high schools is one of a number of similar investigations carried out at the National Foreign Language Center. These surveys have a common focus. They are especially concerned with the organization of our teaching system, with the characterization of the student clienteles, with the general instructional practice, and with the teachers who provide the instruction. The surveys' purpose is to inform both public policymakers and the teachers and administrators engaged in the teaching of these languages. This is in keeping with the general mission of the National Foreign Language Center.

Richard D. Lambert
Director
National Foreign Language Center at the
Johns Hopkins University

Preface

Nearly ten years have passed since the trustees of the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation authorized a modest initiative to invite high school principals from across America to compete for grants of up to $40,000 to begin a program of Chinese language instruction. The commitment initially was $800,000 for twenty schools. It has grown to nearly $3 million, the foundation's largest commitment to any program, encompassing sixty schools, ten summer workshops for teachers, a four-part textbook (*The Chinese Primer*, Harvard University Press), and the establishment of the Secondary School Chinese Language Center at Princeton University.

Language instruction in America is undervalued and underfunded. A mere 3 percent of high school students take a third year of any foreign language—and that is precisely when one begins to think, and dream, in the target language. Spanish has at last become the lead language offered—we are, after all, the *fourth* largest Spanish-language country—but it is unevenly taught and does not embrace the history, literature, music, economics, and politics of those myriad countries to the south with whom our destiny is interwoven.

In November 1982 the Dodge Foundation invited specialists in Russian, Japanese, and Chinese to help the foundation consider whether a national initiative in a less commonly taught language was a viable undertaking. Recognizing that the state of the more typical foreign languages was less than what it might be, the Dodge trustees opted for Chinese, a language connecting six thousand years of history of the most numerous people on earth. The choice was nudged by the clarity of vision and competence of the late Professor Ta-Tuan Ch'en at Princeton, a founder and director of the Chinese School at Middlebury and a teacher himself without peer. A fellow teacher, Robert W. Demeritt, president of the Chinese Language Association for Secondary Schools (CLASS), caught something of the man and his concern for the teachers and the task of superb instruction:

> My first encounter with Professor Ch'en came in 1984 at a Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation–sponsored conference at Ohio State University on the teaching of Chinese at the secondary level. There, many of us in the high school classroom learned of Professor Ch'en's effort to create a textbook suitable for teaching Chinese in our classrooms. Through the lively give and take at that conference and in subsequent conferences in Beijing, Middlebury, the Iolani School in Honolulu, the Breck School in Minneapolis and the Northfield Mount Hermon School in Massachusetts, high school teachers saw the passion, rigor, and humor that T. T. Ch'en brought to his work. The passion inspired us to be passionate about our subject and our teaching. The rigor challenged us to reevaluate our texts,

teaching styles and even our expectations of students. And the humor helped us to get past many of our difficulties.

The Dodge Foundation would not have undertaken this initiative without Professor Ch'en's guidance, generosity, stamina, and esprit. His successor at Princeton and Middlebury, Professor Chou Chih-p'ing, has kept alive the links between the high school teachers and their colleagues at the college level, and has encouraged professional advancement. It was T. T. Ch'en and Chou Chih-p'ing who conducted some six teacher workshops at Middlebury in the 1980s. Dr. Timothy Light planned and organized gatherings at Ohio State University and the Beijing Language Institute.

From the beginning, the teachers themselves began to foster their own community and continuity, most specifically by Dodge-funded meetings in Honolulu and at the Mount Hermon School through CLASS. Many stars shone in this firmament—Luh Nelson, Wei-ling Wu, Margaret Wong, Peter Dratz, Bob Demeritt, Claire Kotenbeutel, Lucy Lee, George Henrichson, Reuben Yang, and Elaine Zanicchi, to name but a few. Chinese became a language accessible to many; it is no longer seen as "exotic." Among the several schools where Chinese instruction took root beyond the Dodge funding was Highland Park High School in St. Paul, where two hundred students are gaining fundamental insights into China and the Chinese through the hub of language. That program was inspired by Margaret Wong and funded with a commitment of $1 million led by the F. R. Bigelow Foundation.

Another evaluation of this Chinese language initiative was undertaken earlier by the National Council on Foreign Languages and International Studies, leading to an article by Rose L. Hayden that appeared in the November/December 1987 issue of *Foundation News* ("Helping Teach the Unteachable") and a report by Kurt E. Müller published by NCFLIS in 1989 (*Funding Curricular Expansion: A Review of the Efforts by the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation to Expand Chinese Language Programs in America's High Schools*).

I would like to commend Sarah Jane Moore for her wholehearted immersion in this evaluation. Maintaining her skeptical stance as an evaluator who is striving to gain an objective handle on the evidence of what happened, how it was sparked, and how it stands to weather the assaults of the 1990s, she has also been moved by the commitment and staying power of the teachers of Chinese who have persevered against the odds and often thrived. After all, how do you quantify a China Night on February 21, 1992, with an audience of hundreds ushering in the Year of the Monkey at West Windsor-Plainsboro High School (a genie from the lamp of Wei-ling Wu), or the creation of an Educational Testing Service Chinese Language Test (another flower of the program)?

What else does the Dodge Foundation do to spur foreign language instruction? It has funded a four-level text in the Russian language authored by Dan Davidson, Zita Dabars, George Morris, and their Russian counterparts. It is assisting Japanese language instruction through the Satellite Educational Resources Consortium. It has provided funds for teacher materials associated with a new fifty-two-part series on Spanish language learning, *Destinos*, by WGBH. And, following on the lead of the Rockefeller Foundation, Dodge has committed support for three years to summer fellowships for teachers of less commonly taught languages under the direction of Dr. Doris Meyer at Connecticut College.

But far and away the Dodge Foundation's biggest commitment in this arena has been to spur and celebrate the devotion of schools and teachers to the teaching of Mandarin. The pages that follow suggest that the investment has been important and will have a long afterlife, especially in the students who one day will be in China—as diplomats, businesspeople, educators, engineers, scientists, and poets—knowing the language and having some feeling for the culture.

Scott McVay
Executive Director
Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation

Acknowledgments

Surveys of this complexity are never solely the work of the authors. At every stage others contribute. We would like to recognize first and foremost the contributions made by the teachers and principals of the schools participating in the survey, and to the students and alumni of those programs. Not only did they spend long hours completing the complex questionnaires, but they were equally generous in giving time and counsel during site visits and professional meetings.

We would like to give special acknowledgment to the founding officers of the Chinese Language Association for Secondary Schools—Robert Demeritt, Peter Dratz, George Henrichson, and Margaret Wong—for the role they played in the survey. They helped shape the questionnaires and spent long hours in discussions on teaching Chinese in high school.

An equally important role was played by the Secondary School Chinese Language Center at Princeton University. The late Professor T. T. Ch'en and his colleague Professor Chou Chih-p'ing were immensely helpful in early stages of the project in comparing high school- and college-level teaching of Chinese. Luh Nelson and Wei-ling Wu provided data on programs collected by the Princeton center as well as encouragement throughout the project.

George Henrichson and Claire Kotenbeutel helped us gather information on students taking the commonly taught modern languages in high school. Christine Morfit, as director of the Chinese program at Sidwell Friends, helped us gain information on students taking Latin as well as helping us understand the variety of ways in which students justify learning Chinese.

When we approached the Carnegie Foundation with a request to examine files on its Chinese Initiative in the 1960s, the files were in the process of being archived. Barbara Finberg made arrangements so that we could use them while the archiving process was under way. For that we owe her a special note of thanks.

The staff of the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation was extremely helpful. Vera C. DuMont was particularly helpful in introducing us to the files on the Chinese Initiative. Susan Pilshaw verified the data on Dodge Foundation grants as a whole for accuracy and reviewed the manuscript.

We would particularly like to thank Scott McVay, executive director of the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, for his support. In the course of the survey we learned that the depth of his support for the Dodge Chinese Initiative went far beyond grant making. When we talked to teachers and principals in the programs it became clear that Scott McVay's constant attention and encouragement were principal factors in the success both of the individual programs and of the initiative as a whole.

Various members of the staff at the National Foreign Language Center have worked on the project. Jennifer Mergy and Lori Fleming deserve special mention for the work they did in preparing the questionnaire data for analysis. Christine Morfit was responsible for managing the publication of this report.

We would like to close by thanking both the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation and the National Foreign Language Center for their financial support of this survey.

Chapter One

Overview

Numerous essays have been published in the last decade on the deplorable state of Americans' ability to speak foreign languages. These essays range from general statements such as Paul Simon's *The Tongue-tied American* to specially targeted arguments about the need for stronger foreign language capabilities in business, science, engineering, and governmental affairs.[1] Curiously, few of these essays argue for the importance of a particular language or class of languages—with the possible exception of Japanese. Yet it is clear that there is a general "foreign language crisis," to use Simon's term; and the overwhelming emphasis on the Western European languages—they still comprise more than 95 percent of all language enrollments—limits our national capacity to deal with an increasingly polycentric world.

The deadweight of existing program offerings and the tendency toward single-language competencies among teachers mean that any change in the national profile of language enrollments will come about slowly. Decision making in our educational system is largely decentralized, and the choice of languages offered by schools and colleges as well as the courses taken by students represents what might be called a constrained free-market system.[2] Changing the distribution of languages offered and taken often calls for school-to-school combat. Over the past few decades, however, there have been a number of deliberate attempts to intervene at the national level in the free-market foreign language system to expand the number of institutions offering and the number of students enrolled in the non–Western European languages. The most visible and most important such attempt is a federal support program introduced in 1958, the National Defense Education Act Title VI, now Title VI of the Higher Education Act, whose goal is to provide training in the non–Western European languages to a limited number of graduate students preparing to become specialists on the countries where those languages are spoken.

---

[1] Paul Simon, *The Tongue-tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis* (New York: Continuum Press, 1980). See also the following articles in *Foreign Language in the Workplace*, ed. Richard D. Lambert and Sarah J. Moore, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 511 (September 1990): Carol S. Fixman, "The Foreign Language Needs of U.S.-Based Corporations," pp. 25–46; Eugene Garfield and Alfred Welljams-Dorof, "Language Use in International Research: A Citation Analysis," pp. 10–24; Howard L. Wakeland, "International Education for Engineers: A Working Model," pp. 122–31; and Ray T. Clifford and Donald C. Fischer, Jr., "Foreign Language Needs in the U.S. Government," pp. 109–21.

[2] See Richard D. Lambert, *The National Foreign Language System*, occasional paper (Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center, 1989).

While Title VI has been remarkably effective in establishing non–Western European language teaching programs at the graduate level in select universities, its impact on promoting instruction in those languages throughout the educational system more generally is undetermined. However, in part because Title VI now resides in the Higher Education Act, its impact on the diffusion of instruction in these languages to the precollegiate level has been indirect and slight. Yet the special demands of learning some of the non–Western European languages argue for beginning the study of those languages as early as possible. In particular, Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, and Korean are what are referred to as Category 4 languages—a designation in the language classification system developed by the Foreign Service Institute and widely used to indicate language difficulty. With their difficult orthographies, their total lack of cognates, and the vast cultural differences in both the content and the context of language use—and in the case of Chinese the special use of tonal differentiation—these languages take native English-speaking Americans as much as three to four times longer to learn. These immense time demands argue for starting instruction as early as practicable. It must be added that while "hard" languages need an early start, they also need very special instructional expertise; early exposure without the necessary special instructional expertise may not help students master these languages at an earlier age.

Enrollments in Non–Western European Languages

Foreign language enrollments in the United States have undergone substantial cyclical changes. The distribution of languages taught and taken is not cast in concrete, although swings in the language preferences of schools, teachers, and students tend to be very slow and long-term. Over the past century there have been substantial changes in the predominance of one or another language—all of them, however, Western European languages.

In the nineteenth century if any language was taught, it was most likely to be a classical language—Greek or Latin. Indeed, Latin maintained its predominance until the late 1920s; at that time, more students studied Latin than all the modern languages combined. The most common modern language taught in high schools was German. There were two or three times as many students studying German as French, the second most commonly taught language. At that time, Spanish was the equivalent of what we would now call a less commonly taught foreign language. Today, as we approach the end of the twentieth century, the percentage of students studying the less commonly taught languages—Chinese, Japanese, and Russian—is similar to the percentage of students studying Spanish at the beginning of this century.

Since the end of the nineteenth century, a new set of languages has been introduced into an already crowded scholastic marketplace, one with lots of slack and lots of jockeying for market share among the few existing favorites. Spanish is now the dominant foreign language taught in American high schools, with twice the enrollments of all other foreign languages combined; German and Latin are on the way down; French is fighting to maintain its position; and Chinese, Japanese, and Russian are trying to find a permanent place.

Instruction in the non–Western European languages has begun to expand in the past few decades, particularly at the postsecondary level. Recent national data, combining total foreign language registrations in community colleges, four-year undergraduate institutions, and graduate schools,[3] show that enrollments in the languages of countries outside of Western Europe increased from 77,723 in 1983 to 113,066 in 1990, a 45 percent increase. At the same time, total foreign language enrollments increased 18 percent. From another perspective, however, enrollments in these less commonly taught languages still constitute a minor proportion of total foreign language enrollments in colleges and universities—only 10 percent.[4] Russian, the non–Western European language with the highest enrollments at both the collegiate and the high school level, has expanded at both levels over the past decade.[5] At the collegiate level Russian experienced an 85 percent increase in enrollments between 1980 and 1990, with larger rates of growth between 1980 and 1983 (27 percent) and between 1986 and 1990 (31 percent) than between 1983 and 1986 (12 percent).[6] Japanese, driven by exploding student demand, is growing exponentially.[7] Between 1980 and 1990, Japanese enrollments at the collegiate level mushroomed by 297 percent, and while the expansion was dramatic throughout the decade, the greatest explosion came between 1986 and 1990, when enrollments almost doubled (95 percent).[8] Collegiate enrollments in Chinese have also expanded immensely over the past decade, growing by 72 percent between 1980 and 1990, with the largest rate of growth occurring between 1983 and 1986 (28 percent). The expansion was 15 percent between 1980 and 1983 and 17 percent between 1986 and 1990.[9]

The collegiate pattern for non–Western European languages—limited representation, but dramatic growth rates—is even more marked at the secondary school level. In 1990 high school enrollments in these languages—Arabic (478), Cantonese (616) and Mandarin

---

[3] Modern Language Association, "Results of the Modern Language Association's Fall 1990 Survey of Foreign Language Enrollments in U.S. Colleges and Universities," news bulletin, 23 September 1991; Richard I. Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments in US Institutions of Higher Education—Fall 1986," *ADFL Bulletin* 19 (January 1988): 39–44.

[4] MLA, "Fall 1990 Survey."

[5] For a full discussion of Russian language instruction in the United States, see John Camerrer and Richard D. Lambert, *Russian Language Teaching in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center, forthcoming).

[6] Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments—Fall 1986"; MLA, "Fall 1990 Survey."

[7] See Eleanor H. Jorden with Richard D. Lambert, *Japanese Language Instruction in the United States: Resources, Practice, and Investment Strategy* (Washington, D.C.: National Foreign Language Center, 1991).

[8] Brod, "Foreign Language Enrollments—Fall 1986"; MLA, "Fall 1990 Survey."

[9] Ibid.

Chinese (6,738), Japanese (26,442), Hebrew (1,609), Korean (5),[10] Russian (17,659), and Swahili (40)—accounted for only 1.1 percent of total foreign language enrollments.[11] This still represents a major improvement over 1985, when Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian represented less than 0.5 percent of total foreign language enrollments.[12] Junior high and high school enrollments in these languages showed spectacular expansion between 1985 and 1990—136 percent, compared with 6 percent for total foreign language enrollments. The growth was led by increases in Japanese (141 percent) and Russian (140 percent); Chinese increased by 116 percent and Arabic by 67 percent. This expansion in instruction excludes any increases (or declines) that may have occurred in private schools.

As recorded in reports on foreign language enrollments in public schools, Chinese enrollments have shown steady growth ever since record keeping for Chinese began in 1962, the only exception being 1970, when enrollments fell. Russian enrollments, on the other hand, appear in these reports to be more cyclical; first recorded as a separate language in 1958 with 4,044 enrollments, Russian expanded to 26,716 in 1965, spiraled down to 5,702 in 1982, and then began a new period of expansion. Enrollments in Japanese were higher than enrollments in either Russian or Chinese throughout the 1980s. Enrollments in other non–Western European languages have remained very small, and while they may fluctuate, the fluctuations are more indicative of the very small size of the programs than of growth or contraction.[13]

How widespread is, and has been, Chinese instruction in the United States below the college level? A tentative answer is provided by a look at the public junior high and high school enrollments as reported by the surveys conducted since 1962 by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). While these data have shortcomings, they are the most comprehensive ongoing source available. Table 1.1 indicates the number of states offering high school Chinese language instruction, enrollment figures, and the change in enrollments.

---

[10] Enrollments in Korean illustrate the fluidity of enrollments in the less commonly taught languages, and also in the state reporting systems. In 1985 there were 184 reported enrollments nationally in Korean, compared with 5 in 1990. The large difference suggests either that all but one Korean program—one having 5 students—disappeared; or that enrollments in Korean were combined with several small-enrollment languages as "other"; or that enrollments were somehow never transmitted to the state record-keeping systems. These data must always be regarded as indicative rather than definitive representations of the enrollment picture.

[11] Jamie B. Draper, *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1989 & Fall 1990* (Yonkers, N.Y.: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, October 1991).

[12] Patricia Dandonoli, "Report on Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1985," *Foreign Language Annals* 20 (October 1987): 470.

[13] Ibid.; "Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall, 1982," *Foreign Language Annals* 17 (December 1984): 611–23; Draper, *Foreign Language Enrollments, Fall 1989 & Fall 1990.*

Table 1.1: Enrollments in Chinese in American Public Schools, 1962–90

Year	Number of States	Enrollments			Percent Change		
		JHS	HS	Total	JHS	HS	Total
1962	6	55	254	309	—	—	—
1963	8	—	—	620	—	—	100.6
1965	13	254	1,099	1,353	361.8	332.7	118.2
1968	15	453	1,643	2,096	78.3	49.5	54.9
1970	10	263	1,082	1,345	-41.9	-34.1	-35.8
1985	11	65	3,344	3,409	-75.3	209.1	153.5
1990	32 *	76	7,278	7,354	16.9	117.6	115.7

* Survey of state foreign language supervisors conducted by the National Foreign Language Center in the spring and summer of 1991.

Source: As reported in Thomas D. Gorman, "Chinese Language Programs in American Secondary Schools 1960–?" (B.A. thesis, Princeton University, East Asian Studies Department, 1973), pp. 83–85; Patricia Dandonoli, "Report on Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1985," *Foreign Language Annals* 20 (October 1987): 470; Jamie B. Draper, *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1989 & Fall 1990* (Yonkers, N.Y.: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, October 1991): 35.

The table shows that there has been considerable growth in Chinese language programs at the secondary level over the past twenty years, in terms of both total enrollments and geographical distribution. These figures also reflect expansions and contractions in the programs from one reporting period to the next. These large swings can be accounted for by schools trying to introduce the language, finding it unviable, and therefore dropping it; or by data being somehow omitted from the reports made by the schools to the state foreign language supervisors;[14] or by enrollments being assigned to a residual category, making it impossible to determine the language to which the enrollments refer. The overall trend, however, is unmistakable—Chinese language programs are expanding at the precollegiate level. Beyond the enrollment data just presented, in 1991 there were twelve elementary schools, fourteen middle schools, and ninety-eight public high schools teaching Chinese, as well as thirty-six private high schools.[15]

Efforts to Expand High School Chinese Language Instruction

In 1982 the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation began its initiative to introduce and broadly support Chinese language instruction in American high schools. It was not the first major foundation to make such an attempt, but the second. The first was the Carnegie Foundation, which had a support program in the 1960s. Much of what Dodge tried to do built upon the strategy that Carnegie had developed in the early 1960s, but with a difference. Carnegie was interested in both high schools and colleges, while Dodge focused solely on high schools. At the peak of the Carnegie program, there were two hundred high schools offering Chinese to their students. Two decades later, however, when Dodge began its high school grant program, only two schools that had been involved in the Carnegie program—St. Louis University High School and Lowell High School in San Francisco—still had active Chinese language programs; and only twenty schools had enrollments of more than ten students.[16] Before focusing on the Dodge Chinese Initiative, it is useful to look at the strategies that the Carnegie Foundation had used two decades earlier in its efforts to foster high school Chinese language programs.

---

[14] From the state foreign language supervisors' reports, it would appear that Chinese is taught in thirty-two states; however, from an independent census of schools, an additional four states can be added to the list. The state reports are not "wrong"; rather, the data are just not reported, or are reported in such a fashion that they cannot be utilized.

[15] Survey of state foreign language supervisors conducted by the National Foreign Language Center in the spring and summer of 1991. The number of private schools teaching Chinese came from a census of all schools teaching Chinese conducted by the National Foreign Language Center in the spring of 1991.

The Carnegie Strategy

Unlike the Dodge Chinese Initiative, which focused on secondary schools, the Carnegie investment was aimed at both the high school and college levels. Funding for both levels was channeled through and controlled by university centers. At the high school level funds were used for salaries. A need was seen early on for the development of suitable textbooks for both college and high school; this led to the DeFrancis texts that are now so widely used in both colleges and high schools. There was a roving consultant who was to help high school teachers deal with difficult instructional problems, and there were summer institutes, one on the West Coast and one on the East Coast. The Carnegie investment was never to be anything but short-term; it was felt that after the initial support period, the schools would be able to develop self-sustaining programs. Carnegie's focus on the secondary school level brought training to teachers in private schools[17] and presumably fostered the development of more elementary-level materials. While most of the efforts went to materials and training, programs developed in different parts of the country varied with regard to which students were targeted and when they were trained. Only one of the programs—developed in southern California—was open to all students; two of the programs were for talented students who spent an intensive summer program learning Chinese followed by a weekend maintenance program during the academic year.

The Carnegie programs had to deal with some of the same myths and preconceptions that the Dodge programs faced twenty years later: (1) that the language was too difficult for high school students to learn; (2) that the Chinese program would draw students away from other more entrenched programs; and (3) that studying Chinese was somehow a non-academic frill.

---

[16] Letter from Scott McVay to the Board of Trustees of the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation, 24 May 1984.

[17] Teachers in public high schools could attend summer National Defense Education Act Title VI teacher training programs, but these programs were closed to private high school teachers.

The Dodge Strategy

The Dodge strategy picked up some elements of the Carnegie strategy but went further. Although Dodge did insist that the selected schools use a campus-based Chinese specialist as an adviser, it focused most of its efforts on the high schools themselves. It also invested in upgrading the curriculum by commissioning a textbook specifically geared to high school needs. It supported the professionalization of the teachers by initiating summer training workshops, and it experimented with bringing Chinese teachers from the People's Republic of China to the high schools to provide fresh perspectives.

The most important feature of the Dodge Chinese Initiative is that it distributed the bulk of its investments directly to individual schools. The Carnegie Foundation chose seven metropolitan areas in which it would support the development of Chinese high school language programs. Dodge, however, initially chose to support individual schools of high academic caliber that were more widely dispersed than those represented in the Carnegie program. Even though most of the Dodge schools turned out to be located in the northeastern section of the country, the basis of selection was academic quality rather than geographical location. Whereas Carnegie looked for local colleges that could serve as models and mentors for the high school programs, Dodge emphasized the selection of schools over the selection of college-based mentors.

Dodge support of the Chinese Initiative has continued for a decade—a long time for any foundation to focus on a single area. A 1984 letter to the Board of Trustees flatly stated, "Our intent is that the quality of instruction be improved, enrollment grow, and the number of schools climb slowly and steadily for the balance of this decade."[18]

Survey Strategy

The strategy of the National Foreign Language Center survey was to take a comprehensive look at the entire range of elements in the Dodge Initiative and at the high schools where projects were funded. The conclusions and recommendations that we make in this report draw from questionnaires, site visits, and interviews.

Questionnaires

Specific questionnaires were developed for principals, teachers, students currently in the programs, and program alumni who had gone on to college. The principal's questionnaire was concerned with issues relating to the integration and institutionalization of Chinese within the school. The teacher's questionnaire was concerned with various indicators of the teachers' professional qualifications, the nature of the instructional process, and articulation both up and down in the system—that is, the continuity (or lack thereof) between a student's experience in high school Chinese classes and what he or she took in junior high school or in college. The high school student's questionnaire was concerned with who the students were, why they chose to study Chinese, and what their long-term goals were, both regarding the study and use of the language and their general career plans.

---

[18] Letter from McVay to Board of Trustees, 24 May 1984.

Batteries of questionnaires were sent to the fifty-five schools that had received funds from Dodge and had active Chinese language programs in 1988–89. A few of the newly funded schools had not yet started a Chinese program, and one or two had not been able to continue the programs they had begun. Questionnaires were filled out by forty-three of the principals and forty-eight of the teachers. Questionnaires were also obtained from virtually all of the students studying Chinese in the schools for which teachers returned questionnaires—some 1,783 students in forty-nine schools. The return rate was remarkably high for each segment of the questionnaire surveys. This is undoubtedly a tribute both to the value placed on having the Chinese language program in these schools and to the Dodge Foundation's continuing support and encouragement.

The procedure for surveying the program alumni who had gone on to college was more elaborate, since the school had both to identify the students and to provide current (mostly home) addresses. Schools were asked to provide lists of graduates who had entered college in 1987 and 1988—the two most current cohorts. For some schools it was not possible to develop an address list of former students, either for us to mail the questionnaires directly to the students, or for the school to mail them while maintaining the security of the student addresses.[19] A brief questionnaire was sent to 476 college students who had studied Chinese and had graduated from one of the forty-eight schools in 1987 or 1988. In all, 211 of these graduates responded. To make it more likely that we could reach these college students, we mailed the questionnaires just prior to the Memorial Day weekend and the Fourth of July holiday, on the assumption that that was the best time to find students at home. Only one mailing was made to each student. Given the complexity of the operation and the general lack of enthusiasm of college students for returning anything, the 42 percent return was remarkably high, and it indicates the high value these students placed on their high school Chinese language training.

It turned out that sending the questionnaires to a home address also elicited letters from several parents who chose to respond to the questionnaire in the absence of sons or daughters away for the summer. An important component of the success of an academic program is the enthusiasm or support of parents for its introduction or maintenance. These letters not only gave some insight into parental attitudes; they also uniformly suggested that the parents were proud that their children had had an opportunity to study Chinese in high school and that taking Chinese had been a positive and enlightening educational experience. All of the parents who responded indicated that their children had continued to pursue Chinese language studies in college.

---

[19] For two schools it was against district policy to provide a third party with student addresses. Those schools mailed the questionnaires directly.

Site Visits and Interviews

The questionnaire surveys were supplemented by participation and observation at four national and statewide meetings of the high school teachers; by site visits to twenty-four high school programs, including one program with a distance-learning component; by meetings with state supervisors of foreign language instruction in California, Nebraska, and Oregon; and by an examination of the individual files on the Chinese Initiative centrally maintained and regularly updated at the Dodge Foundation. High schools that were site-visited were chosen so as to represent geographical spread, districts with Chinese programs in schools beyond those supported by the Dodge Foundation, schools with newly introduced programs, schools with well-developed programs, variation in the professional qualifications of teachers, and variation in the size of the program. At the site visits, meetings were held with the principal, academic guidance personnel, other foreign language faculty, the foreign language chair, district foreign language supervisors, and students in the programs. In addition, the Chinese classes were observed.

Other Information Collected

As the survey proceeded, it became obvious that some key information was missing. The survey had gathered a great deal of data on high school students taking Chinese, but no information on how they compared with students taking other languages. To provide some insight into this question, two teachers of Chinese, who were also the chairs of foreign language departments in their respective schools, were asked to find out if their colleagues teaching other foreign languages would be willing to give the high school student questionnaire to students taking French, German, Latin, and Spanish in their schools. Thanks to the cooperation of the foreign language faculty in these schools, questionnaires were returned from approximately two hundred students studying these four Western European languages, allowing us to compare them with students studying Chinese.

A very abbreviated questionnaire was sent to 138 schools teaching Chinese that have not received funding from the Dodge Foundation. The list of high schools teaching Chinese was developed from the files of the Secondary School Chinese Language Center at Princeton University and from a publication by Dorothy Goodman listing American schools teaching Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Russian.[20] The questionnaires were created so that a list of all schools presumably teaching Chinese in a state was sent to each school in that state for verification and amendment. From an examination of the returned questionnaires, a questionnaire was then sent to each additional school that was mentioned as having been omitted from the original list for that state. Following this strategy, questionnaires were sent out in four waves. In all, 105 of those schools responded. The objectives of this questionnaire were to develop a comprehensive census of schools teaching Chinese; to collect enrollment data; to examine the importance of having native teachers in Chinese language programs; and to examine the general stability of these programs. When these schools are mentioned in the course of this report, they will be referred to as the "non-Dodge schools."

---

[20] *Directory of U.S. Elementary and Secondary Schools Teaching Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Russian* (Washington, D.C.: Friends of International Education Institute for Crucial Languages, 1991).

The National Foreign Language Center is also conducting national surveys of instruction in Japanese and Russian. Both of these studies are also covering high school–level instruction and include as part of their samples several schools participating in the Dodge Chinese Initiative. The format of those surveys is similar to that used for the Chinese survey. When the results of those surveys are available, it will be possible to generalize more widely about students taking the less commonly taught languages in high school.

Additionally, since one of the questions we are interested in is the fit between high school and college Chinese language programs, we briefly explored the point of view of the professoriate toward the high school Chinese language students entering their college programs. A short questionnaire was designed and distributed to Chinese language professors at the annual meeting of ACTFL in November 1989, asking them for their opinion as to the preparation of high school Chinese language students for college. We also asked them what elements they would emphasize if it were up to them to determine the organization of high school programs. We see this as the beginning of a more general exploration of the fit between high school and college language instruction.

The Dodge Schools

It should be noted that the Dodge Foundation took great care in selecting the schools it would support with grants. These schools generally have high academic standards, high average Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, a high percentage of students continuing on to college, and a high percentage of students studying foreign languages. This seems a rational strategy of concentrating resources where the impact of the investment is likely to be maximized. One consequence of this selectivity, however, is that these schools cannot be considered "average" or "typical." The reader should be aware that the data presented in this report represent the most favorable case. A strategy aimed at a cross-section of programs, not just the most highly developed ones, might have somewhat less impact, and the average level of development of the Chinese language instructional programs would be lower than in the Dodge schools. The selectivity of Dodge's sample of institutions is highly relevant for that discussion.

Table 1.2 lists the fifty-five Dodge grantees and indicates the type of survey data we received from each. Schools with an asterisk following their name were site-visited; a few non-Dodge schools were also visited, but they are not included in this list. The headings "principal," "teacher," "high school student," and "college student" refer to the four main questionnaires described earlier. The heading "CTL student" refers to students taking the commonly taught Western European languages—French (F), German (G), Latin (L), and Spanish (S)—who also filled out the high school student questionnaire for purposes of comparison.

Table 1.2: List of Dodge Grantees, Indicating Questionnaire Returns and Site Visits

School	Principal	Teacher	High School Student	College Student	CTL Student
Albany High School		X	X		
Barstow School *	X	X	X	X	
Bellaire Senior High School	X	X	X	X	
Bellevue Public Schools *	X	X	X	X	
Bethesda-Chevy Chase HS *	X	X	X	X	
Booker T. Washington HS *	X	X	X	X	
Boston Latin School	X	X	X	1987	
Breck School *	X	X	X	X	
Bronx HS of Science	X	X	X	X	
Brookline Public School		X	X	NA	
Calasanctius School	X	X	X	X	
Central-Hower HS *	X	X	X	NA	
Cherry Creek HS *		X	X		
Columbus Alternative	X	X	X		
East Lyme HS			X		
HS of Engineering & Science					
Hunter College	X	X	X	X	
Isidore Newman	X	X	X	X	
James Madison Memorial HS *	X	X	X	X	FGS
Kennewick School District	X	X	X	NA	
Lincoln Public Schools *	X	X	X	NA	
Longmeadow HS	X	X	X	X	
Mamaroneck HS	X	X	X	NA	
Metropolitan School District	X	X	X	X	
Milton Academy					
Monterey Peninsula *		X	X		
Mount Edgecumbe School	X	X	gone	X	

School	Principal	Teacher	High School Student	College Student	CTL Student
Murphy HS	X	X	X	X	
Northfield Mount Hermon *	X	X	X	X	FGLS
Orange HS *	X	X	X	X	
Philadelphia HS for Girls					
Phillips Academy/Andover	X	X	X	X	
Phillips Exeter Academy					
Ridgewood HS	X	X	X	X	
Rockville HS *		X	X		
St. Ann's School	X	X	X	X	
St. Catherine's School	X	X	X	X	
St. Louis University HS	X	X	X	X	
St. Paul's School	X	X	X	X	
Seaholm HS	X	X	X	NA	
Service High School *	X	X	X	X	
Sidwell Friends *	X	X	X	X	L
South Eugene HS *	X	X	X	1988	
South HS *	X	X	X	X	
Springfield Central HS	X	X	X	X	
Springfield HS of Commerce	X	X	X	X	
Thomas Jefferson HS *	X	X	X	NA	
University HS					
University School of Milwaukee	X	X	X	X	
Upper Arlington HS	X	X	X	X	
Walnut Hills HS					
West Hartford Public Schools					
West Windsor; South Brunswick	X	X	X	1988	
Wissahickon School District	X	X	X		
Xaverian Brothers HS	X	X	X		

Outline of the Report

Because of its pioneering nature, the Dodge Chinese Initiative deserves attention in its own right. In addition, however, it represents an interesting example of a particular style of intervention that can provide more general guidance about how to expand enrollments and also some insight into the specific features of our high schools that determine the success or failure of such programs in a hostile-to-neutral environment. As the following analysis will show, there are special challenges involved in introducing and institutionalizing instruction in an "exotic" language in the context of the American high school. Where, how, and how well this has been accomplished is related in the following pages.

This report will proceed in the following fashion. Chapter 2 will discuss the general characteristics of the programs supported by Dodge and the schools and geographical settings in which they are found. Chapter 3 will describe the teachers in those programs, and Chapter 4 the content of the instructional process. Chapter 5 will discuss classroom practices and resources. Chapter 6 will describe the students in these programs as well as recent alumni of the programs who have entered college. Chapter 7 will draw some conclusions and make recommendations for the future.

Chapter Two

Schools and Programs

When the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation introduced its Chinese Initiative in the early 1980s, the Department of Education was about to publish a report, *A Nation at Risk*, that would publicly dramatize the need for educational development and expansion in a number of academic areas.[1] That report served throughout the 1980s as a call to pay attention to education. At the same time, the American economy was at the beginning of a growth stage that provided greatly expanded resources for new programs. Both private and public schools were actively looking for ways to enhance the educational opportunities of their students. Many were responding to the national movement to bring a more international perspective to their curricula, and China was an increasingly important part of the world. Hence, when school administrators received the letter of invitation from the Dodge Foundation to compete for funds, or when schools read about the competition in educational journals, many found it to be an attractive opportunity. It is an open question whether so many schools would have responded so positively in the 1990s, an era of greater financial stringency and a more inward-looking national mood.

Program Selection Strategy

After initially considering Russian and Japanese in 1982, the Dodge Foundation solicited proposals for the establishment of high school Chinese programs on three different occasions. The first request for proposals was sent out in 1983 to high schools in which ten or more advanced placement examinations were given annually. The second solicitation was made through a notice and article in *Education Week* (January 11, 1984), and the third (January 1987) was made to an even broader audience.

The proposals that high schools had to submit were quite substantial and included the following elements: a paragraph on the importance of studying Chinese; a five-year budget indicating how the school would incorporate the costs of the program into the general budget; any existing courses that included an East Asian or Chinese component; library resources; special competencies of the faculty; nearby college or university resources; any local Chinese community that could be drawn upon; languages taught, and their enrollments and attrition rates; qualifications of the proposed teacher (including a tape recording of his or her voice); recruitment strategies for both teachers and students; obstacles to success; the level of administrative support (faculty, school board, school, and district administration); and the impact on the school as a whole.[2] The time and effort needed to prepare a proposal to the Dodge Foundation clearly signaled that these grants would be for the development of serious academic programs.

---

[1] *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*, report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, David P. Gardner, chairman (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1983).

Prior to making a grant, Dodge winnowed the applications down to a manageable number through evaluations by outside readers, and then made a visit to each potential site to evaluate the proposal and the school's ability to carry out the intended plan. What the school received from Dodge was generally a grant of $40,000, payable in two installments—the first upon receipt of the award if the Mandarin teacher was known and approved, and the second only after the program was up and running successfully. In addition, many if not all of the teachers participated in at least one of the summer teacher workshops funded by the Dodge Foundation.

Dodge's commitment to the Chinese Initiative has been made evident to the participating schools by the regularity of contact between the foundation and the school; minimally, Dodge has requested, and received, annual enrollment figures from each school, usually accompanied by a short summary of what has been happening with the program generally. This constant contact, even after the grants have been expended, reminds the schools that they have made a substantial commitment to the Chinese language program, and that someone at the national level is paying attention and thinks such programs are worthwhile. Although intangible, this external voice has been of some importance in maintaining local commitment and in drawing attention to the fact that Chinese programs are both possible and desirable in high schools. Indeed, on a number of site visits it became clear that some teachers of other less commonly taught language were envious of the fact that the Chinese programs derive local support from a national presence, and that there is a place that will provide support for teacher training and curriculum development, as well as a center at Princeton University to provide information on professional training and development.

School Sites

Schools that have been funded by Dodge vary in size from the very small (total enrollment under one hundred students) to the very large (over two thousand). Most are located in larger-population areas, usually in cities of one hundred thousand to five hundred thousand, and they are about evenly divided between urban (46 percent) and suburban (44 percent) areas. Ten percent of the programs are in schools located in rural areas. While the term *rural* often suggests less affluent schools, the rural schools involved are actually prestigious private schools. Even though it is thought by some that Dodge was inclined toward funding private northeastern schools, this is not the case: two-thirds of the schools funded are public schools. Slightly fewer than 25 percent of the programs are in nonreligious private schools; 10 percent are in church-related schools. Most schools were not teaching

---

[2] Invitational letter for the third round of Dodge funding dated January 23, 1987.

Chinese at the time of their application; 44 percent are located near other schools where Chinese is taught.

In addition to having other schools that teach Chinese nearby, many of the schools (40 percent) had a substantial Chinese community in their neighborhood. Sixty percent were in communities having "Saturday schools" set up within the Chinese community to teach young people their ancestral language. A number of schools drew support from a sister-city connection with a Chinese city. In several cases the more general linkage was used to develop a special relationship with an individual school in the sister city. Forty percent of the Dodge schools reported that their city had a sister city in China, and almost one-fourth reported that they had an individual relationship with one or more schools in China or Taiwan.

Some of the schools in which Dodge has supported a Chinese language program are magnet schools, and a few others are focused on science, language, or international studies. Surprisingly, however, none of the specialized schools has a focus on the arts. As will be noted later, a number of students indicated that they were studying Chinese primarily because of a strong interest in Far Eastern graphic arts, design, or calligraphy. On the other hand, a number of students freely admitted that their expressed interest in Chinese was in part a strategy to enhance their chances of admission to a math/science magnet school.

School Size

As mentioned earlier, Dodge funded schools ranging in size from fewer than one hundred students to over two thousand. When organizing the curriculum, the principal must deal with the precollegiate analogue to FTEs (full-time equivalences—prescribed minimal and maximal numbers of students in each classroom). These effectively translate into the number of teachers that can be supported by the school. When adding a program that is at least initially marginal, a calculation must be made as to whether the school will have the numbers to support the new program in both the short and the long term. Another variable is the relative wealth of the school—is it in an expanding or a contracting mode? Again, the calculus must incorporate into the equation the total number of demands, their individual costs and values to the student body, and other demands placed on the school by external sources, such as the state legislature, state boards of education, and the like. All these demands make it difficult for schools with a small student body to introduce and to sustain innovations. It is possible that the Dodge Chinese Initiative came along at the right time; the general economy was expanding along with school budgets, and schools and districts were looking for ways to expand their offerings. But now, in the 1990s, with the economy shrinking and with state legislatures and Op-Ed writers crying for "accountability in the school system," Chinese programs, particularly those in small schools, may have a difficult time surviving. They will need to find a way to appeal for, and find, support from an audience larger than the school itself.

Links with Other Schools

One of the hopes the Dodge Foundation had when it made its initial grants was that somehow these carefully selected schools would serve as a vanguard from which Chinese programs would spread to other nearby schools and districts. Some evidence suggests that such a diffusion has taken place. Schools in New Jersey, Ohio, and Minnesota have undertaken Mandarin Chinese; the most notable example is a $1 million investment led by the F. R. Bigelow Foundation in Highland Park High School, St. Paul, Minnesota. There is some evidence also that as word has spread to nearby schools, individual students in those schools who might want to study Chinese have applied for transfer into the program. The Dodge schools have served as beacons drawing in clientele rather than as models copied by other schools.

In some cases this beacon pattern is part of an existing consortial arrangement. Such arrangements are not uncommon; slightly over 25 percent of the schools report that they have such an arrangement, usually of a general nature. While eight of the schools have consortial agreements, only two have consortial arrangements that are restricted to Chinese, and in only two cases do other consortium schools also teach Chinese. Five of the consortial arrangements include both public and private schools. Nine of the schools have students coming in from elsewhere.

Since the development of consortial arrangements seems to be an obvious solution to low and dispersed student demand for instruction in particular languages, the survey examined in detail some of the problems of implementation that must be overcome. It is clear from both questionnaire responses and site-visit interviews that consortial arrangements are difficult to organize. While they are attractive in theory—schools pool their individual strengths to better serve the combined student body—it is a constant headache to make them work. The most obvious problems involve moving people from one school to another. If the arrangement calls for moving students, either they or their parents have to arrange transportation, or the local school district has to schedule the movement of consortial students around the varied opening and closing times of elementary, middle, and senior high schools, along with other demands such as sports and activities. In order to fit everything in, students often have to spend lunch hours or study periods moving from school to school. These finely tuned arrangements are also subject to disruption by inclement weather or by variations in schedules at individual schools. Sometimes the problem is handled by offering consortial subjects either before or after school—which poses the attendant problems of having students leaving for school before daylight or coming home after dark. Our interviews indicate that a surprising number of students are so determined to study Chinese that such obstacles are overcome. The most extreme example was a pair of students who drove fifty miles each way to attend an almost predawn introductory Chinese 1 and then Chinese 2 class before graduating to a more comfortably scheduled Chinese 3 class.

An alternative to moving students around from school to school is to move the teacher. This arrangement is easier to coordinate, but it may leave each class with too few students to operate effectively. Moreover, as an itinerant the teacher may face status problems at each of the schools, as well as the difficulty of not having a single location from which to coordinate all the activities of an effective program.

A number of other problems of consortia emerged in the data. For instance, a financially equitable allocation of costs to the participating schools is not easy to ensure. In addition, consortial arrangements can be strained when the reputations and philosophies of particular schools are quite different. In general, however, consortial arrangements seem to be better than diffusion of freestanding programs as a means of solving the immediate problem of making the Chinese language more available at the high school level.

Allocation of Dodge Funding

The Dodge Foundation has invested $2.7 million[3] since 1982, with five interlocking programs supporting and developing the Chinese language field at the high school level:

— grants to sixty individual high schools;

— grants for a series of summer workshops for teachers;

— a grant to develop a textbook appropriate for high schools;

— grants to the American Field Service (AFS) to bring teachers from the People's Republic of China to the United States; and

— grants to create and sustain the Secondary School Chinese Language Center at Princeton University, which through a newsletter to all schools informs the teachers of educational opportunities.

Three of these programs funded national-level supportive activities that Dodge viewed as important for the general development of the programs in individual schools and that were beyond the means of any individual program to undertake. These funds were primarily devoted to workshops aimed at upgrading teachers' skills and to the development of a textbook suitable for high school students. Beyond that, Dodge funded the development of a set of videotapes to accompany one of the more popular textbooks used, and to support the AFS teacher exchange program. The funding that Dodge gave to AFS was earmarked to bring in teachers from the People's Republic of China in order to bring another authentic voice of the living culture to the classroom, and to supplement the skills of some teachers whose spoken Chinese was initially weak. However, most of the funding went to individual schools. Table 2.1 shows the distribution of funding.

---

[3] This sum includes two grants for external evaluations of the Chinese Initiative.

Table 2.1: Allocation of Dodge Funds, by Category

Category	Percent of Funds
Individual schools	71.7
Teacher workshops	6.6
Videotape production	1.3
Textbook development	5.1
AFS teacher exchange	6.7
Princeton center	5.3
External evaluations	3.3

Source: Annual reports of the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation.

Allocation of Funds to Schools

The bulk of the funds were given to individual schools. Each school negotiated independently with Dodge on how to utilize the funds in order to maximize the development of its Chinese program. Generally, the agreement was that after Dodge was convinced that the school could sustain a satisfactory Chinese language program with an acceptable teacher, it would give the school an initial grant of $20,000 to launch the program. After two years Dodge would ask an outside educator to evaluate the program on a site visit, and if it was found satisfactory, the school would receive another $20,000 grant. While there are some deviations from this pattern, most schools received a grant of $40,000 delivered in two stages.

Table 2.2 breaks down the number of reporting schools by the size of their grants. Most of them received the standard $40,000 grant, while a few received somewhat less. Only one school, not participating in the survey, received significantly more than $40,000.

Table 2.2: Size of Dodge Grants

Amount of Grant	Number of Schools
$40,000	31
$30,000	1
$25,500	1
$20,000	6
$10,000	3

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

For all practical purposes, each school received the same amount of money. Those listed as having received $20,000 are mainly ones that in 1983 already had a Chinese language program; the quality of their effort was thought to warrant an added boost. The initial grants stipulated that Dodge would ask an outside educator to evaluate the program after a two-year start-up period to determine whether or not to continue with the second half of the grant. Those schools receiving other than the standard grant were ones for which the grants were made for more limited purposes. For example, one school with a large number of Chinese-Americans studying Chinese received a grant to try to increase the number of non–ethnic Chinese students.

Use of Funds within Schools

How did the schools make use of the grants? To some extent the viability and durability of the programs are related to the schools' utilization of the funds. The more creatively they were used in program development (as opposed to offsetting general costs), the greater the potential for the long-term durability of the program.

Principals were asked to estimate the percentage of funds allocated in eleven separate categories: administration, teacher salaries, textbooks, audiotapes, videotapes, general equipment, computer software, visitors, field trips, teacher travel (to workshops and for other purposes), and other activities. Tables 2.3 and 2.4 show how these funds were budgeted. Table 2.3 indicates the allocation of funds by all schools combined, with the last column showing the percentage of schools that did not utilize any funds in a given category. For instance, only 2 percent of the total Dodge funds for all schools was used to offset administrative costs, and 81 percent of the schools used none of the funds for this purpose.

Table 2.3: Schools' Utilization of Dodge Funds, by Category

Category	Percent of Total Funds Allocated	Percent of Schools Allocating No Funds
Administration	2	81
Salaries	71	19
Textbooks	6	51
Audiotapes	1	61
Videotapes	2	67
Equipment	4	63
Software	1	77
Visitors, speakers	1	86
Field trips	1	81
Teacher travel to workshops	3	44
Other teacher travel	1	91
Other activities	3	68
Unencumbered	4	—

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

As might be expected, the bulk of the Dodge funds (71 percent) went to subsidizing teacher salaries. Not all the programs utilized their funds for salary subsidies; 19 percent used no Dodge funds for teacher salaries. For the most part, those schools that did use the grant for salaries used a fairly high proportion—over 50 percent—for that purpose. The next highest percentage of funds went toward the purchase of textbooks, followed by teacher travel to professional meetings. Most schools used some portion of the funds for teacher travel and for textbooks. Schools that did not allocate Dodge funds for the purchase of textbooks used funds available through their normal sources for textbook purchases. Only small amounts of money were spent for visitors and speakers to enhance the Chinese program, or for students to take field trips. In this case, most schools did not allocate funds for the purpose of enhancing the program. The "other activities" category includes purposes as diverse as teacher training, the development of library resources on China, curriculum development, and the purchase of equipment to be used in the teaching of Chinese calligraphy. Again, a small portion of the funds was used to cover administrative costs, and again, most schools did not use funds for this purpose. Those that did account for funds in this category generally said that they were for substitute teachers or for fringe benefits.

Table 2.4 shows the variation among schools by indicating the percentage of schools that spent various amounts of Dodge funds in each category. Whereas Table 2.3 indicates that 2.0 percent of the schools utilized funds for administrative purposes, Table 2.4 indicates that 2.3 percent of those schools used 30 to 40 percent of their Dodge grants for administrative purposes, while 81.4 percent used no Dodge funding for this purpose.

Table 2.4: Allocation of Funds by Expenditure Category (percent of schools)

Category	Percent of Funds Allocated									
	0	1-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	30-40	50-75	80-90	91-95	100
Administration	81.4	9.3	0.0	3.7	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salaries	18.6	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.6	20.9	16.3	14.0
Textbooks	51.1	34.9	4.7	0.0	2.3	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Audiotapes	60.5	37.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Videotapes	67.4	30.2	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Equipment	62.8	30.2	2.3	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Software	76.7	20.9	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Visitors, speakers	86.1	11.6	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Field trips	81.4	14.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Teacher travel to workshops	44.2	44.2	0.0	4.7	2.3	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other teacher travel	90.7	7.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other activities	66.7	26.3	2.3	4.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

Clearly, different schools had different spending patterns. Most of the money was used to defray the cost of teacher salaries. Fewer than 20 percent of the schools funded teacher salaries from sources other than the Dodge Foundation. Fourteen percent used their Dodge funds solely for salaries. Almost two-thirds of the schools used the Dodge funds to defray 50 to 95 percent of the cost of salaries. This general reliance on external funds for salary costs does not bode well for the long-term health of such programs. In fact, when we asked the principals whether the continuation of their program still depended on external funding, 50.0 percent said that it was very important, 42.1 percent that it was important, and only 7.9 percent that it was unimportant. It will be interesting to see what the survival rate of these programs is five or ten years hence when the external funding dries up.

Program Durability

How durable are these programs? We asked the principals of the schools to judge their long-term prospects. Would the programs still be operating one year hence, three years hence, five years hence? Table 2.5 presents the results.

Table 2.5: Security of Chinese Programs as Projected by Principals

Degree of Security	Percent of Principals Projecting This Degree of Security		
	Next Year	In 3 Years	In 5 Years
Very secure	94.8	69.7	51.4
May be continued	2.6	30.3	45.7
Likely to be discontinued	2.6	0.0	2.9
Number of cases	39	33	35

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

At least one more year's continuation of the program seemed guaranteed, and two out of three principals felt very secure about the continuation of the program three years into the future. However, only about half of them were willing to make a strong bet on the continuation of their particular programs for five more years.

Have these programs lasted? Since the Dodge Foundation began the Chinese Initiative in 1982, fifteen of the sixty schools funded have in fact discontinued their Chinese language programs. Of the forty-three schools responding to the questionnaire, six schools, presumably a stronger subset of all Dodge-supported schools (13.9 percent), discontinued the program. These were not fly-by-night programs. Three of those schools had been teaching Chinese for seven years, and the others for six, five, and three, respectively, when they dropped it. Moreover, most of them had received Dodge support long enough for them to have gained a following.[4]

A similar picture of the turnover in programs emerges from the results of a supplemental questionnaire sent to 138 non-Dodge-supported high schools reported on various national lists to be teaching Chinese.[5] Of the 104 schools that responded, 20 (19.2 percent) had already discontinued their Chinese language program. In addition, 26.3 percent of the principals felt that their school was unlikely to continue the existing Chinese program for the next three years, 18.2 percent that it was moderately likely, and 55.6 percent that it was very likely. Like the Dodge-supported programs, the non-Dodge Chinese programs that were discontinued were not latecomers. The average age of the discontinued programs was four years. Seven were stopped after their first year, but one program had been in existence for twenty years and another for nine.

---

[4] Survey completed by the Secondary School Chinese Language Center, Princeton University, December 1991.

[5] This complementary survey is described in Chapter 1 as the "non-Dodge survey."

Both the figures for actual turnover and the projections of future durability show that Dodge-supported programs are somewhat more secure. In both cases, however, life for Chinese language programs—indeed, for all instruction in the less commonly taught languages—is anything but secure.

Constraints on Durability

In the principals' view, on what does the future maintenance of the program depend? There are two sources of information on this question: first, the hypothetical statements of principals of Dodge-supported schools as to the relative weight of various factors in the successful continuation of a program (Table 2.6); and second, the reasons given by principals of non-Dodge-supported schools for why their Chinese programs were discontinued (Table 2.7).

Table 2.6: Importance of Components of Successful Programs as Rated by Dodge-School Principals

Component	Percent of Principals			Number of Responses
	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	
Student interest	95.3	4.7	0.0	43
Gifted teacher	81.4	18.6	0.0	43
School board support	71.1	23.7	5.2	38
Parents' interest	59.5	38.1	2.4	42
Importance of language in the world	59.5	40.5	0.0	42
External funding	50.0	42.1	7.9	38
Support of language teachers	34.9	46.5	18.6	43
Support of local ethnic community	12.2	51.2	36.6	41

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

Table 2.7: Reasons Non-Dodge Schools Discontinued Chinese

Reason	Percent of Schools
Decline in enrollments	40
Decision external to the school	35
Departure of teacher	30
External funding ended	30
General budgetary cutbacks on programs	30
Program quality	5

Note: Multiple responses allowed.

Source: Non-Dodge survey.

In the eyes of both Dodge- and non-Dodge-school principals, budgetary considerations are obviously strong constraints on the future continuation of programs: although half of the Dodge-school principals did not see this as a problem, 30 percent of the principals of defunct programs referred to general budgetary cutbacks as a major reason for discontinuation. It can be surmised that this reason is even more potent now. The presence of a sympathetic and supportive principal and/or district supervisor was felt to be important to the continuation of Dodge programs. Only 16 percent of the Dodge-school principals foresaw that a school board policy decision might demolish the Chinese program; 35 percent of the non-Dodge-school principals indicated that this was where the decision was made. In fact, among the schools in the Dodge programs as well, the departure of sympathetic administrators or the loss of their support was mentioned as a principal reason for the cessation of the Chinese program.[6] It is interesting to note how small a role the substantive aspect of the program plays: only 12 percent of the Dodge-school principals suggested that competition with other academic innovations might cause the program to be discontinued. In fact, competition for enrollments with Japanese was singled out as a reason in the 1991 survey of Dodge-supported schools.[7] Only 5 percent of the non-Dodge programs were discontinued because of the quality of the program, and this was not mentioned as a reason for any of the Dodge-sponsored programs.

An interesting sidelight of this survey of the non-Dodge schools is that 30 percent reported dropping Chinese language instruction because external funding stopped. On the one hand this indicates the durability of those that continued; but it also points a warning finger at the danger of external grant dependence in any attempt to introduce less commonly taught languages into inhospitable high school settings.

The Importance of the Teacher

Both sets of data highlight the central importance of teacher quality to the success and durability of programs. Forty percent of the Dodge-school principals believed that the program might fold if a particular teacher left; 30 percent of the non-Dodge schools that discontinued their Chinese programs gave the departure of a teacher as a principal reason. The quality of the teacher is viewed not only as a safeguard against the demise of a program but as an essential ingredient in its success. When the Dodge-school principals were asked specifically about what it took to establish a successful Chinese program, they emphasized overwhelmingly the necessity of finding the right teacher. As one principal put it, "A good teacher, a good teacher, a good teacher." Another elaborated, "An excellent teacher who puts the time into outreach activities within the school, feeder schools, and the community." This is not to say that principals do not recognize the importance of their own role or of school supervisors, school boards, parents, and academic staff including the language faculty; they do. Overwhelmingly, however, all the principals report that the skill of the teacher is the key to the program's success.

---

[6] Survey completed by Secondary School Chinese Language Center, Princeton University.

[7] Ibid.

What is true of the successful establishment of a program is equally true of its durability. Site-visit interviews indicated that even some of the strongest programs would be in danger of disappearing if a gifted, entrepreneurial teacher were to leave.

Enrollment Levels

In the surveys of both Dodge and non-Dodge schools, enrollment levels were the bottom line for the principals on whether or not to continue a program. While one can wax eloquent on the importance of offering students a diverse academic program to meet their individual interests, a school cannot long support a program that does not meet minimal enrollment requirements, however lenient those requirements may be. Whether enrollments are presented on a per-department, per-teacher, or individual-teacher basis, they cannot stray very far for very long from the established minimum. It is in overall enrollments that the Chinese language programs are weakest. For this reason, a detailed examination of enrollments in the Dodge programs is essential.

There is some variation among programs. The largest program, one that survived from the Carnegie days, has a stable enrollment from year to year of about seventy students. Another is closer to ten. But by and large the programs all have enrollments of around forty students, often spread over four years of instruction.

To dramatize further the weakness in enrollments that threatens the Chinese language programs, comparative data on total program size and enrollments by course level were collected for the other languages taught in schools that received Dodge support for Chinese. The first column of Table 2.8 indicates the number of schools on which the mean language enrollments are based, and the second column presents the mean enrollment for all reporting programs. For instance, the data on French are based on responses from forty schools, and the mean size of the French programs in those schools is 300.1 students per school. The other columns present the mean enrollments in each language by instructional level.

Table 2.8: Mean Foreign Language Enrollments, by Level

Language	Number of Schools	Mean Number of Students per School					
		Program	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Chinese	37	41.2	21.2	11.8	8.5	8.5	—
French	40	300.1	76.6	92.1	74.6	44.6	25.1
German	28	75.1	33.2	21.5	14.2	11.9	7.3
Japanese	8	76.9	42.1	19.6	10.3	6.7	—
Latin	28	140.6	53.3	37.0	28.8	31.1	17.4
Russian	21	44.0	20.5	14.6	10.2	8.1	5.0
Spanish	39	411.8	135.2	133.8	86.3	43.4	21.4

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

The table illustrates the generally marginal role of the non–Western European languages in high schools—except for Japanese, where a surge of first-year enrollments brings it up to the level of German. Total enrollments in Russian and Chinese are comparatively low. Even in first-year classes the mean enrollment levels hover around the danger point of twenty students. At the advanced level, enrollments require special justification. The table also highlights the inherent competition among languages in what is often viewed as a zero-sum game of winning enrollments. Russian threatens German, Chinese threatens Russian, and Japanese threatens them all.

While there is some competition among the non–Western European languages, the greater struggle is with French, Spanish, and to a lesser extent German. Chinese teachers feel that the traditional system of language choice in the United States is making things especially difficult for them. For instance, compare the enrollments in first- and second-year French and Spanish. It would seem that 120 percent of the students in first-year French are continuing into the second year, and 99 percent of students in first-year Spanish continue on into the second year. These remarkably high continuation rates are a product of the large numbers of students in the level 2 courses who have had one or two years of the language in junior high school and are continuing to follow the natural sequence on into high school. Twenty-two of the schools have larger enrollments in French level 2 than in level 1, and the enrollments differ by fewer than ten students in another five schools. In other words, almost two-thirds of the schools teaching French appear to be recruiting students both from entering freshmen who have been exposed to the language in the middle schools and from students who have no prior exposure. Five schools teaching German show a similar pattern. Five schools teaching Latin have more students enrolled in level 2 than in level 1. Seventeen schools teaching Spanish have a larger enrollment in level 2 than in level 1, and another eight schools show a difference of fewer than ten students between the two levels.[8]

What these data dramatically demonstrate is that one of the greatest and most persistent anxieties among the Chinese language teachers, one that marks them off from teachers of Spanish and French, is the fear of low enrollments. The Chinese teachers know that the key to the well-being of their nascent programs is enrollments, and the key to enrollments is recruitment. However, they feel that they are constantly thwarted in their efforts to publicize the program and recruit students. One of the first obstacles is that a number of schools (eight specifically reported it) restrict entry into the Chinese language program. To enroll in Chinese, students must have already studied another foreign language, be recommended by the foreign language department, be juniors or seniors, be on the honor roll, be interviewed, and/or submit a formal application. As a consequence, students rarely have an opportunity to begin Chinese until fairly late in their high school careers, and teachers do not have a sufficient number of students to develop a three- or four-year sequence in Chinese. A second obstacle that the teachers report is their inability to recruit in the middle schools. They note that French and Spanish teachers are recruiting students directly into the second level of instruction from the middle schools. Enterprising teachers have tried to introduce similar middle school feeder programs in Chinese and have often been met by an emphatic rebuff.

---

[8] This pattern of higher enrollments in the second year than in the first occasionally appears in a less commonly taught language, but it is usually evidence of the entry of native-speaker students at a level above the introductory.

The teachers find themselves in a quandary. They need students if their programs are to develop and survive, but they are hampered in their efforts to recruit. Where they are permitted to recruit, they often show great ingenuity. On teacher used the school display case at every opportunity to highlight the Chinese program. The original purpose of the case had been to highlight a variety of academic subjects, one after the other; however, this teacher managed to come up with reasons for constantly featuring something related to Chinese—culture, history, art, science. The display case is now almost wholely given over to the Chinese program. Most teachers manage to introduce Chinese cultural materials into the high school assembly on the occasion of the Chinese New Year or other holidays. One teacher borrowed traditional Chinese costumes and put on a fashion-show-cum-folk-dance festival, then videotaped it for recruitment purposes. Another ordered Chinese fortune cookies for the entire school; that the cookies all contained fortunes that were somewhat risque was discovered just in time to avert disaster. Finally, several schools have made and sold T-shirts highlighting the year of the dragon, horse, or the like, not only to advertise the Chinese language program but also to build up a contingency fund that could be used to enhance the program. In short, the teachers have been quite innovative in developing means of advertising their program and recruiting students. To survive and flourish, they must.

General Support for the Program

The low level of enrollments in most Chinese programs means that the programs must depend upon the support of others. Where does that support come from? We asked the teachers to rate the relative level of support the program received from various sources. Table 2.9 shows the percentage of teachers giving particular ratings, from "very unsupportive" to "very supportive," to each source. The final column assigns each source a mean supportiveness score, with higher values indicating greater support. A score of 1.0 in the final column would indicate "very unsupportive," and a score of 5.0 "very supportive."

Table 2.9: Supportiveness of Various Sources of Support as Rated by Teachers

	Percent of Teachers					
Source	**Very Unsupp.**	**Unsupp.**	**Neutral**	**Supp.**	**Very Supp.**	**Mean Score**
Principal	0.0	2.2	15.2	15.2	67.4	4.5
Language faculty	4.3	4.3	10.6	25.5	55.3	4.2
School board	2.4	2.4	16.7	23.8	54.8	4.2
Students	0.0	2.2	26.7	28.9	42.2	4.1
Parents	2.4	2.4	31.7	17.1	46.3	4.0
General community	0.0	2.5	35.0	22.5	40.0	4.0
Guidance office	0.0	2.3	32.6	39.5	25.6	3.9
Nonlanguage faculty	0.0	2.2	44.4	31.1	22.6	2.5

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

What the table demonstrates is that the teachers generally feel that there is a great deal of support for the Chinese language program in their high schools. Except for the guidance office and the nonlanguage faculty, the mean level of support on this scale falls into the "supportive" category and leans toward "very supportive." This is particularly true of the principals, whose mean level of support on this scale of 4.5, the highest for any source. Clearly, the enthusiasm of the principal is a key ingredient in a successful program.

Administrative Support

The overwhelming support that the teachers report coming from the principal's office is not entirely surprising, since one of the criteria by which schools were selected by the Dodge Foundation was the level of support perceived at the administrative level. The survey data showed that Dodge program officers kept in close touch with a number of the more supportive principals. However, the need to foster longer-term support from the principal's office is clear. This need is dramatized by the evidence from the few schools where the principal has changed since the original grants were made. Several of those schools were included in the site visits in order to see what happened when there was a change at the top. The new principals appeared to be much more oriented toward the bottom line of enrollments than those who had been involved in the Chinese language programs from the beginning. Though not unsympathetic toward the programs, they did not appear to have any personal commitment to their success.

Indeed, one of the surprises of the survey is that the Dodge Foundation and other intervention programs do not seem to have a longer-term strategy for fostering the principal's support. Understandably, in the development of Chinese language programs most of the energy is directed toward finding the "right" teacher; less attention is focused on other parts of the school system. However, a failure to educate the principals, administrators, and academic school leadership means that a crucial part of the equation for strong, ongoing Chinese programs is being left out. In the initial applications and the site visits, Dodge paid some attention to administrators and school leadership, but little attention to that aspect after the programs were in place. On one of the site visits, a principal remarked that he had no idea what the school was getting into when it started the Chinese program. He was not talking so much about low enrollments and the need to nurture the Chinese teachers—many of whom are quite naive about the workings of a school; rather, he meant the difficulties of the language, what it takes to master it, and how much active support from the principal is required to make the program successful and to overcome the resistance it might meet from other teachers in the school. An indication of such difficulties lies in the report by the Chinese teachers that the lowest level of support for their program comes from the faculty outside the language department. One suspects that that group might show a low level of support for the study of *any* foreign language, with Chinese being an extreme case.

While it is encouraging to see that, with the exception of some members of the nonlanguage faculty, there is widespread support for the Chinese language programs, there are other pockets of concern. While the foreign language faculty is generally perceived to be supportive, 20 percent of the Chinese language teachers perceive them as being either neutral or unsupportive. In the course of the site visits, several concerns and explanations for this lack of support were mentioned. Other members of the foreign language faculty perceive the Chinese program as being in direct competition for a limited number of students. It is widely believed that a decline in enrollments in these budget-conscious days may very well put an individual's job in jeopardy. Moreover, other foreign language teachers often perceive the Chinese teachers, with their low-enrollment classes, as not carrying their share of the departmental teaching load. This negative view is offset by several Chinese teachers' strong emphasis that it was a teacher of French or Spanish who had been their greatest supporter and mentor during the growth period of the program.

The academic guidance office is another group within the school that the Chinese teachers perceive as not being fully supportive. Thirty-five percent of the teachers find guidance office staff to be either neutral or unsupportive of their efforts. This was more true in the public schools than the private ones. Support from the guidance office is particularly critical to the successful introduction of a new academic program into the high school curriculum, since it is the guidance office staff who advise students on which courses to take and which to avoid. One indication of a lack of enthusiasm on the part of the guidance office was that on site visits it was often difficult, and sometimes impossible, to set up an appointment to meet with an academic member of the office. The opinions of guidance counselors as expressed in site-visit interviews varied widely. In one school the view was that if a student had a talent for foreign languages, he or she should be signed up for as many languages as possible—if one foreign language is good, four is better. A more prevalent view was that math, science, and English were more important. A student should not jeopardize his or her grade point average and opportunities for college admission by taking a difficult language course or one that might be regarded as not academically serious.

The Role of Parents

While two-thirds of the parents were perceived as being supportive of the program, one-third were perceived as being neutral or unsupportive. In terms of the long-run stability of the program, this is an important group, for their support can see a program through hard times. Sometimes parents are important supporters of the program. More often they are neutral bystanders.

Teachers were asked a series of questions about the involvement of parents in the program. When looking at parental support of high school programs, one is delving into relatively uncharted territory. While it is considered appropriate and normal for parents to be fairly intimately involved in the education of their preschool and primary school children, as the children progress up the educational ladder, the parental role becomes more and more remote and difficult to perceive, and it almost seems to disappear somewhere in high school. Nevertheless, high school teachers were asked a series of questions about their views of parental support and participation in the program.

The survey questions were of two types—how parents were involved in the program, and what the teachers did to get them involved. Additionally, principals were asked to indicate how parents were involved. Table 2.10 shows the teachers' assessment of the parents' involvement.

Table 2.10: Parental Role from the Teachers' Perspective

Type of Involvement	Teachers Reporting This Type of Involvement	
	Percent	Number
Keep parents informed as to their child's progress in learning Chinese	83.3	40
Try to meet individually with parents about their child's progress in learning Chinese	47.9	23
Keep the PTA informed about the Chinese language program and its welfare	41.7	20
Parents are used to chaperone students at special Chinese cultural events	39.6	19
Parents are involved in helping to arrange cultural events at the school (such as Chinese New Year's)	37.5	18
Invite parents to visit the classroom to see what it's like to learn a language like Chinese	31.3	15
Try to get parents to work actively with their children in learning Chinese	31.3	15
Make suggestions to the PTA and academic administration about possible presentations on the Chinese program at meetings	27.1	13
Students organize cultural programs for parents	20.8	10
Parents who speak Mandarin, if any, are used as speech models for the students	8.3	4
Parents suggest ways in which the Chinese language class can be made more interesting and effective	6.3	3

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The major way in which the teacher interacts with parents is as an informant, keeping them informed about the progress of their children or the Chinese program itself through the PTA. A second means of interaction is for parents to serve as chaperones at school-sponsored events or to be involved in a cultural event sponsored by the Chinese program. A third level of participation is for parents to be invited to visit the classroom and see what it looks like, or for them to work with their children in learning Chinese, presumably in the traditional parental role of traffic cop. Parents are least likely to be involved as a resource in the development of the Chinese language program—either as speech models or on pedagogical matters. Another strategy that is used less frequently is for students to organize an event for parents. This is consistent with adolescents' growing sense of independence and their natural desire to cut the apron strings. Indeed, when asked whether their parents had anything to do with their decision to study Chinese, students were adamant that it was their own decision, not their parents'. The question was whether they had decided to study Chinese because of parental interest/pressure; almost every one of the 471 students who said that their parents had something to do with the decision emphatically crossed out the "pressure" component of the question.

Principals were also asked to evaluate the role of parents in the introduction of the Chinese program into the high school. Their perspective is presented in Table 2.11.

Table 2.11: Parental Role from the Principals' Perspective

Type of Involvement	Principals Reporting This Type of Involvement	
	Percent	Number
Newsletter keeps parents informed on educational matters	90.7	39
Parents help out at school-sponsored events	88.4	38
School has a PTA	83.7	36
Parents have a role as policymakers	79.1	34
Parental interest is important in maintaining the Chinese program	74.4	32
Academic matters are discussed at the PTA	65.1	28
Parents are consulted on innovative programs	62.8	27
Chinese program has been discussed at the PTA	51.2	22
Parents are involved in homework	34.9	15
Parents' expertise is important to supplement the Chinese program	25.6	11

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

The view from the principal's questionnaire supports what the teachers report—that the parents' role is removed from the classroom, but they may have a useful advisory role. Eighty percent of the principals report that the parents have a role as policymakers in the school—as members of school committees, school boards, and so on—and most report that the school has a PTA. In a majority of the schools academic matters are discussed in the PTA, parents are consulted on innovative programs, and the Chinese program was vetted before these audiences. Even more important is the role of parental interest in maintaining the Chinese program—almost three-quarters of the principals state that their interest is important. But when the principals are asked about the role of parents within the school—their involvement with students and their homework, or use of their expertise—the percentages drop off dramatically. Clearly, the parental role, if there be one, is to serve as an advisor on broad policy, not to participate in the instructional process per se.

In one other cut at the role of parents, principals were asked to estimate the level of support from parents in the introduction of the program. Table 2.12 presents the results.

Table 2.12: Parental Level of Support from the Principals' Perspective

Level of Support (Mean Level = 3.5)	Principals Reporting This Level of Support	
	Percent	Number
Not asked	22.0	9
Not interested	0.0	0
Neutral	6.2	2
Moderate support	37.5	12
Enthusiastic support	56.3	18

Note: Percentages for the level of support exclude the "not asked."

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

Nine principals said that parents were not asked about the introduction of the program. The rest reported that the parents were moderate (37.5 percent) to enthusiastic (56.3 percent) supporters of its introduction. The principals clearly felt that they had a mandate from parents to establish the program and to make it work.

Other Courses on China

Chinese language instruction does not usually stand alone in the school. It is normally accompanied by other substantive courses on China. Indeed, one measure of the success of a program of Chinese language instruction is the presence of related courses that can provide the student with some cultural context for language study. Given the general education requirements put on high school students, the number of nonlanguage courses offered that were either fully or partially concerned with China was remarkable. Table 2.13 indicates both the variety and the prevalence of the nonlanguage courses on China available to students in these programs.

Table 2.13: Schools Offering Nonlanguage Courses on China

Course	Percent	Number
Any course on China	74.4	32
China: history, civilization, culture, literature	23.3	10
Asian studies	23.3	10
Social studies	14.0	6
History: world, United States	12.0	5
Global studies	9.3	4
Religion	9.3	4
Geography	5.0	2
China and United States, USSR, and/or Japan	5.0	2
Comparative culture	2.3	1
Area studies	2.3	1
International relations	2.3	1

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

Just under 75 percent of the schools regularly offered at least one other course that dealt with China. This course often predated the language course, and in many cases it was a teacher of a nonlanguage course dealing with China who became the Chinese language teacher, or who was instrumental in formulating the proposal to the Dodge Foundation.

Most schools had only one nonlanguage course that dealt with China; seven schools had two courses; one school had three; and one school had four. Most commonly that course was a course in Asian studies or a general course concerned with China's history, civilization, culture, or literature. In order of frequency these were followed by social studies, history, and global studies.

Summary

This chapter has described the context and some of the constraints within which the Chinese language programs operate in the high school environment, beginning with the distribution of funding from the Dodge Foundation and ending with the support the Chinese programs receive from various sources in the school. The schools selected to participate in the Dodge Chinese Initiative represent a wide variety of institutions—large and small; urban, suburban, and rural; private and public. The major criterion that Dodge considered when choosing schools was academic strength; these schools therefore represent the upper end of the academic continuum. The schools selected used the Dodge funding in a variety of ways, but the most common use was to pay the teacher's salary. Principals were basically optimistic in the short run about the durability of the programs, but less so for the longer run. The principals were concerned that shrinking enrollments, budget cuts, or the departure of the teacher could force the programs to be discontinued. Closer looks at the language enrollments in these schools showed how fragile the programs are. Counterbalancing the factors that may weaken the programs is the generally strong support principals and teachers perceive within the school system and the wider community. Parents were perceived as being particularly important and supportive. Above all, the programs' well-being rests with the teacher as the creator, nurturer, and developer of the program.

In the next chapter the characteristics of the teachers are described in some detail.

Chapter Three

Teachers

The major responsibility for the development and maintenance of high school Chinese language programs lies with the teachers. Students come and go; principals—although their strong support and encouragement are essential for long-term development and growth—have too many other responsibilities to take full charge of the nascent instructional programs; parents, school boards, and local community leaders all see the school from different and changing points of view and rarely focus on instructional offerings. It is the teacher who is there day in and day out, year after year, and who therefore has the major responsibility for program development, maintenance, and expansion.

Chinese language teachers are sometimes slow to recognize the degree of their responsibility for the program, and many find it hard to respond positively to the challenge. Indeed, some are simply overwhelmed. After all, the teacher is trying to introduce a new instructional program with no or little training in teaching the language, little experience in working in the American high school environment, few instructional materials, and not even a set of agreed-upon instructional objectives, either for any one level of instruction or for a fully developed four-year curriculum. From the point of view of the outside observer, the challenge facing the teacher is enormous.

Who Are the Teachers?

There are many stereotypical descriptions of the "typical" high school Chinese language teacher, some accurate, many less so. An accurate picture must begin with a few descriptive indicators. With those in place, these teachers' problems and roles come more clearly into focus.

Age

High school Chinese language teachers are, on the average, slightly older than other high school teachers. Table 3.1 describes the general age pattern for Chinese teachers and compares it with the national picture. The data were collected in a slightly different fashion for the two groups. The first two categories of the Chinese sample (ages 20–29 and 30–39) are comparable to the first category of the national survey (under 40). Similarly, the last two categories of the Chinese sample (ages 50–59 and 60 and older) are comparable to the last category in the national survey (50 and older). The Chinese sample consists of the forty-eight teachers responding to our questionnaire, while the national data are drawn from a Department of Education survey.

Table 3.1: Age of High School Chinese Teachers and High School Teachers Generally (percent)

Age	Chinese Teachers	All Teachers
20–29	8.3	NA
30–39 (<40)	22.9	48.4
40–49	47.9	32.4
50–59 (50+)	18.8	17.9
60+	2.1	NA
Not reported	—	1.3

Source: Teacher's questionnaire; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education, 1991*, vol. 1, *Elementary and Secondary Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 96.

Almost one-half of the Chinese language teachers are between the ages of 40 and 49, while only about one-third of all high school teachers fall into this category. In addition, there is a slightly higher concentration of Chinese teachers in the over-50 age group. It would appear that a slightly older group of teachers provided the first wave of Chinese instruction in the Dodge schools; but if these programs are to be sustained and to expand, younger teachers must be recruited.

Gender

It is frequently lamented that American students do not have many male role models among their high school teachers. This is as true for Chinese as for other secondary school disciplines, including foreign languages generally, as Table 3.2 demonstrates.

Table 3.2: Gender of High School Chinese Teachers, Other High School Language Teachers, and High School Teachers Generally (percent)

Gender	Chinese Teachers	Language Teachers	All Teachers
Male	25.0	24.6	29.3
Female	75.0	74.6	70.2
Not reported	—	0.8	0.5

Source: Teacher's questionnaire; U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, National Data Resource Center, "School and Staffing Survey, 1988" (unpublished, n.d.); *Condition of Education, 1991.*

Like most language teachers, Chinese teachers as a group show a heavier concentration of women than high school teachers in general do. While there are questions about the general effect of teachers' gender, the linguistic effect of this predominance of females is less in Chinese than it might be in languages—for example, Japanese—in which male and female speech patterns differ dramatically; gender differences in Chinese are of much less linguistic importance. Moreover, at the college level the gender ratio among Chinese teachers shifts dramatically toward a higher proportion of males.

Ethnicity

The maturity of a foreign language profession in the United States can be gauged by the extent to which it is dominated by non-native as opposed to native speakers of the language. If that measure is used, Chinese language instruction in the United States is at a very early stage, for native Chinese speakers predominate among the teachers in the Dodge programs.

Table 3.3 compares the ethnic backgrounds of Chinese language teachers from Dodge and non-Dodge schools. The two surveys differed somewhat. The Dodge teachers were asked to identify the country of their birth; since none of the Dodge teachers was an American-born Chinese, birthplace worked as a device to assign ethnicity. For the other survey, administrators of non-Dodge Chinese programs were asked to identify the ethnic composition of the teaching staff as "Chinese," "Asian," or "other ethnicity." Since the two sets of designations present slightly different pictures of the Chinese language teachers, both will be used.

Table 3.3: Ethnicity of Dodge and Non-Dodge High School Chinese Language Teachers (percent)

Ethnicity	Dodge Teachers	Non-Dodge Teachers
Ethnic Chinese	74.5	74.6
Taiwan	(14.9)	NA
People's Republic of China	(55.3)	NA
Hong Kong	(4.3)	NA
Asian	NA	6.9
Other ethnicity (i.e., American)	NA	18.5
American-born	25.5	NA

Source: Teacher's questionnaire; non-Dodge survey.

What is remarkable about these two sets of figures is the extent to which the Dodge Chinese language teachers mirror the national pool of Chinese language teachers. In both cases essentially 75 percent of the teachers are from a Chinese-speaking part of Asia or are American-born Chinese. From teacher conferences it is known that at least some of the "ethnic Chinese" non-Dodge teachers are American-born, although the exact percentage is unknown.

The high proportion of ethnic Chinese among the teachers raises important pedagogical issues. Discussions at teacher workshops and with individual teachers indicate that the two groups confront somewhat different problems in the classroom. For the American-born teachers, problems center around the adequacy of their Chinese language skills and their firsthand cultural knowledge of growing up in a Chinese society. For teachers raised in Taiwan and the People's Republic of China, the problems arise from the special demands of the American high school setting. The teaching techniques these foreign-born individuals experienced in their own language learning are inappropriate for the less directive atmosphere of most American classrooms.

While ethnically based differences in pedagogical style are no doubt important, the evidence of the site visits and the teacher workshops is that the teachers somewhat overemphasize that importance. From the perspective of the outside observer, ethnic differences among teachers are trivial compared with the common challenge of classroom instruction. At this stage of the development of the high school Chinese language teaching community, attention should be focused on the many areas in which all teachers, whatever their ethnicity, need assistance: curricular design for each level and across levels, pedagogical strategies appropriate for high school students, standardization, and evaluation. These are problems shared by all members of the high school Chinese language teaching community, and they must be resolved as that community matures.

How Professional Are They?

If there is one desire shared by all the teachers in these programs, it is that they be recognized as professional educators specializing in the teaching of the Chinese language in the high school environment. Their intuition is that they *are* professionals—dedicated to giving their students the best training they can in Chinese language and culture, and to providing them with the skills they will need to continue further training in college; striving to improve their own skills; searching for means of having their skills and programs verified to be as legitimate as those of other teachers; striving to become accepted members of the teaching faculty in their schools, in their districts, and in their communities. In fact, they are slowly accomplishing their goal of being perceived as professionals. Isolated in their own institutional settings, teachers have a hard time recognizing their own progression along the continuum from purveyors of ad hoc, unorganized, peripheral instructional programs toward full professional status. In this section we will discuss some of the indicators of professionalization, and where the Chinese teachers and programs might be placed on that continuum.

Education

As Table 3.4 illustrates, these teachers are highly educated, in terms of both the degrees they hold and their education in the Chinese language and in language methodology. The table shows not only the proportion of teachers holding a particular degree and the proportion who have been trained in Chinese and in language methodology, but also whether the degree was an arts and sciences degree, an education degree, or a double degree in both schools.

Table 3.4: Educational Background of High School Chinese Language Teachers (percent)

Background	B.A. B.Sc.	M.A. M.Sc.	Ph.D. D.Ed.	Chinese Major	Chinese Minor	Language Methodology
Liberal arts	70.8	39.5	14.6	22.9	8.3	14.6
Education	25.0	29.2	12.5	2.1	4.2	37.5
Both *	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3
Neither	0.0	27.1	72.9	75.0	87.5	39.6

* With one exception, teachers indicating both schools have training in the PRC combined with an American degree.

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

This is a highly educated group of teachers. All have at least an undergraduate degree, 73 percent have a master's degree, and 28 percent have a Ph.D. By comparison, in 1986 50.7 percent of all teachers in public schools had an M.A. and only 0.7 percent had a Ph.D.; in private schools 29.4 percent had an M.A. and 1.3 percent had a Ph.D.[1] In terms of their education in the language, 37.5 percent of the Chinese language teachers either majored or minored in Chinese. Both native and non-native speakers of Chinese are represented among those having specialized college training in Chinese; 31 percent of the native Chinese speakers and 54 percent of the non-native speakers majored or minored in Chinese. At the same time, 60.4 percent have had some training in foreign language methodology. Interviews indicate that in the main, this training took place at the Dodge-sponsored summer teacher workshops. Over time, the role of the schools of education in the preparation of high school Chinese language teachers will surely increase. There is in fact almost no training nationally available in the technology of pedagogy specific to Chinese. Another sign of the early stage of professionalization in the field is the low proportion of degrees in education held by the teachers.

One of the accepted "facts" about teachers who are native speakers of Chinese is that it matters whether they were educated in Asia or in the United States. Teachers educated in Asia are presumed to have developed teaching approaches that are not totally compatible with the philosophy underlying American secondary school education, particularly as it relates to the behavior patterns of American students. Table 3.5 presents the educational migration histories of the teachers who are native speakers of Chinese.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Table 59, "Selected Characteristics of Public School Teachers: Spring 1961 to Spring 1986," and Table 52, "Characteristics of Private School Teachers by Level and Affiliation of School: 1985–86," *Digest of Education Statistics, 1989*, 25th ed., NCES89-643 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1989).

Table 3.5: Highest Level of Education Attained Prior to Migration of Native-Speaker Teachers of Chinese

Level	PRC > US	Taiwan > US	Other > US	PRC > Taiwan	PRC > Taiwan > US	PRC > Other > US
Elementary	0	0	0	1	1	2
Junior high	0	0	0	1	0	1
High school	2	1	0	0	0	0
B.A., B.Sc.	9	10	2	0	0	0
M.A., M.Sc.	0	1	0	0	0	0
Ph.D.	1	0	0	0	0	0

Note: The "more than" symbol (>) is used to indicate migration from one country to another. For example, "PRC > US" indicates migration from the People's Republic of China to the United States.

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

All of the responding native speakers have had some of their educational training abroad—fairly equally divided between the People's Republic of China and Taiwan.[2] Most of the teachers came after receiving their B.A./B.Sc. Looking down the first column (PRC > US), it can be seen that no individual moved to the United States from the People's Republic after finishing either elementary or junior high school. Two individuals migrated to the United States after completing high school; nine after the B.A./B.Sc.; none after the M.A./M.Sc.; and one after the Ph.D. Columns two and three have similar interpretations. The final two columns indicate that a teacher had been educated in the People's Republic of China and one other country prior to migrating to the United States.[3]

From this illustration of the educational migration patterns of the native-speaker Chinese teachers, it can be concluded that these teachers have all had experience learning in at least two different educational systems, and that migration normally involves only one other country before the move to the United States. It is also true that migration occurs more frequently after the initial undergraduate degree—the B.A. or B.Sc. Of the twenty-seven teachers who have higher degrees (M.A. or Ph.D.), only three took those degrees outside the United States.[4]

These data may give some support to the often-heard lament that native Chinese speakers have difficulty adapting to the American secondary school teaching environment. This conclusion is based on the assumption that the culture in which the teacher was educated affects his or her ability to adapt to an American teaching environment. Since almost two-thirds of these teachers were educated through the B.A. level in Asia, one a priori conclusion might be that native speakers need training so that they may become more familiar with American educational practices, particularly those found in the American high school. On the other hand, this is not a conclusion that would arise from visiting classrooms. During the site visits, what was remarkable was the similarity of the problems encountered and strategies used by *all* the teachers. Handling a classroom full of teenagers appeared to be as much a challenge for the native English speakers as for the native Chinese speakers. This is not to say that the students were ill-behaved; they were not. Rather, creating an optimal learning environment within a classroom setting that prizes individualism is difficult for all teachers of Chinese. Very few of the tables show any difference between native-speaker and non-native-speaker teachers; classifying native-speaker teachers by the point at which they migrated made no difference in these conclusions. In the absence of data on student outcomes, it is difficult to see exactly what the consequences of these two learning environments are.

---

[2] Only three of the native-speaker teachers did not respond to this question. These teachers had also migrated at some point; they had not been born in the United States.

[3] Three of those individuals had received a B.A./B.Sc. in the intervening country prior to migrating to the United States, while one individual migrated after completing high school.

[4] Two received an M.A. in Taiwan before migrating to the United States for the Ph.D., and one received a Ph.D. in the People's Republic of China prior to migration.

Chinese Language Competency

The minimal indicator of a Chinese language teacher's professionalization is his or her competency in the language. For most other languages there is a general national trend toward requiring teachers in the public secondary, middle, and elementary schools to demonstrate competency in the language in order to receive a foreign language teaching certificate. For most languages these demonstrations of competency are test-based and include an oral proficiency component in accordance with guidelines developed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).

Certification of language competency is a problem for Chinese language teachers. The only pencil-and-paper testing instrument available is the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) Chinese Proficiency Test; the other instruments are variations on the oral proficiency interview assessments, specifically the ACTFL/ILR (Interagency Language Roundtable) Oral Interview or the Foreign Service Institute Oral Interview, and the Foreign Service Test that is normally limited to government employees. These tests are not used universally, nor are they widely known. For example, one teacher encountered in a site visit was desperately looking for some test that could be used in her state to verify her competency in Chinese. Even the state supervisor for foreign languages was unaware of any Chinese tests available. This case was particularly ironic because the teacher was a native speaker of Chinese, having moved to the United States from the People's Republic of China within the previous five years. A more common practice is to regard native speakers of Chinese as, by definition, competent in the language and to excuse non-native speakers from meeting a competency standard because they fill a need that cannot otherwise be met within the existing educational system.

This does not mean that teachers have not made use of the tests that are available. Slightly over one-third of the non-native speakers of Chinese had taken a test designed to demonstrate competency in the language. The test most frequently mentioned was the Foreign Service/ILR/DLI (Defense Language Institute) test. No one mentioned either the CAL Chinese Proficiency Test or the ACTFL/ILR test. Two non-native Chinese teachers said that they had been required to take a standardized Chinese proficiency test for their current positions, and one said that she would have to take one in the future.

In the absence of standardized test results, the only indication of language competency is self-evaluation. Table 3.6 presents the self-evaluations of the non-native speakers.

Table 3.6: Non-native Speakers' Evaluations of Their Chinese Language Abilities (percent)

Level	Speaking	Listening	Reading	Writing
Survival level	0.0	0.0	12.5	12.5
Beyond survival, but limited	12.5	12.5	6.3	12.5
Able to use the language occupationally, but with definite limitations	18.8	18.8	43.8	50.0
Able to use the language occupationally and socially at near-native level	56.2	56.2	18.7	6.3
Ability equivalent to native	12.5	12.5	18.7	18.7

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

Most of the teachers rate themselves as having at least an occupational control of the language, and they judge their competencies to be higher in speaking and listening than in reading and writing. Nonetheless, as will be noted later, as a group they feel just as responsible for teaching their students to read and write Chinese as for teaching them to speak and understand it. While individuals typically rate their own skills slightly higher than a rigorous test might actually show them to be, these self-ratings do indicate that most of these teachers feel sufficiently in control of the language to teach it at the high school level. It should also be noted that for high school teachers, "ability to use the language occupationally" does not necessarily imply the same degree of control as would be needed by a medieval scholar, a diplomat, or an international business executive.

While most states have not determined how teachers should be tested in order to demonstrate competency in the Chinese language, the teachers regard it as an important professional issue. A priority item on their agenda is to develop procedures by which their professional competency can be validated. Among themselves, they have developed a simple, informal means of establishing competency: while both English and Chinese are used, much of what happens at meetings or workshops of high school Chinese language teachers takes place in Mandarin, both in the professional meetings and in the informal conversations at meals or in lounges. A non-native speaker's listening and speaking competency is quickly assessed and the person placed on a competency scale according to how well he or she can understand and contribute to the proceedings in Chinese. For native speakers the measure is slightly different. They are judged on the basis of how close their accent is to *Pũtōnghùa*[5] and how profound a knowledge they have of the Chinese language. The measure is rough and probably not generalizable to a higher level of measurement, but it serves well within the small body of Chinese language teachers to bestow an imprimatur of professional competency. Indeed, it seems clear that major portions of the workshops or meetings are held in Chinese precisely in order to affirm competency in the language. This practice implies a double standard for native and non-native speakers, but at least there is some minimal standard of competency by which all teachers are judged.

---

[5] This is a term for modern standard Mandarin and can be translated literally as "the common language." In this report a tilde is used to represent the third tone in the pin-yin transcription system, rather than the breve—the symbol used in English dictionaries to represent a short vowel.

In fact, the teacher's accent—not pedagogical background—was a major criterion in the selection of teachers in the Dodge Chinese Initiative. All teachers had to present a tape to the Dodge Foundation for assessment. It was only after a school had found a teacher with an acceptable accent that a grant would be made.

Experience

Another indicator of professionalization is the total number of years the individual has been employed as a Chinese language teacher in an American high school. The mean for this group of teachers is 4.8 years, but the range is quite large. Twenty-seven percent have taught two years or less, while thirteen percent have taught eight years or more. To a large extent this group's limited amount of high school experience reflects the sudden expansion of employment opportunities resulting from the Dodge grants, which began in 1982. Clearly, many programs hired inexperienced teachers at the outset, but by the time of this study their average seniority was a substantial five years.

The teachers bring to the classroom not only their high school teaching experience but other teaching experience as well. Table 3.7 indicates the percentage of teachers who have been engaged in various other types of teaching activities and the mean number of years they were active in those situations. Since it can make a great deal of difference whether that teacher's native language is Chinese or English, the two groups have been separated.

Table 3.7: Teachers' Experience in Various Educational Situations

	Percent of Teachers		**Mean Years**	
Situation	**Chinese Speakers**	**English Speakers**	**Chinese Speakers**	**English Speakers**
Taught in a Chinese educational system	42.9	0.0	2.0	0.0
Taught native Chinese speakers	57.1	23.1	2.7	1.6
Taught English speakers in China	34.3	15.4	0.8	0.2
Taught English speakers in the United States	88.6	92.3	6.1	4.8
Taught course on China in the United States	60.3	53.8	1.7	2.1

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

As the table illustrates, many of the teachers had taught native Chinese speakers, and much of the teaching had been done in the United States; only 43 percent of the native Chinese speakers—and, not surprisingly, none of the native English speakers—had taught in a Chinese educational system. Again, 57 percent of the Chinese speakers had had native Chinese-speaking students, while 23 percent of the English speakers had taught in that situation. The discrepancy between those who had taught native speakers and those who had taught in China may be explained by experience teaching in "Saturday schools"—schools established in Chinese-speaking communities outside of China to pass along the ancestral language to the next generation. One-third of the native Chinese-speaking teachers (34 percent) had taught English speakers in a Chinese-speaking country; almost all of them (89 percent) had taught English speakers in the United States, and 60 percent had taught a course on China in the United States. Only 15 percent of the native English speakers had taught English speakers in China, but 92 percent had taught English speakers in the United States, and a full 54 percent had taught a course in English on China. Surprisingly, the native Chinese speakers had had more experience than the native English speakers in each of the situations, including having spent more time (6.1 years, compared with 4.8 years) teaching Chinese to English-speaking students in the United States. While a greater percentage of native Chinese speakers had taught a course on China in the United States, the native English speakers had, on the average, spent more time teaching American students about China.

Another aspect of the teachers' experience component is the educational levels at which they have taught. Table 3.8 indicates the percentage of teachers having worked at various educational levels. Since many of them had worked in more than one setting, the percentages in this table are based not on the 48 teachers, but rather on the 117 different areas in which they had worked. A teacher was counted once for each setting in which he or she had worked. In other words, the table dilutes the experience of working in any one setting in order to stress the variety of settings in which the teachers had worked.

Table 3.8: Percentage of Teachers Having Worked at Various Educational Levels

Level	Percent
Elementary	17.0
Junior high	16.0
High school	37.0
College	30.0

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The table shows that teachers had generally worked in high schools already, or had had experience in college, a perception that is confirmed by Table 3.9. But this tells only part of the story, since many of the teachers had worked in multiple settings. Table 3.9 shows some of those multiple teaching experiences. The percentages are based on the experience of each of the 48 teachers, rather than on the 117 different areas in which they had worked.

Table 3.9: Percentage of Teachers Having Worked in Multiple Settings

Setting	Percent
Junior high school	2.1
High school	6.1
College	2.1
Elementary and high school	12.2
Junior high and high school	8.2
High school and college	28.6
Elementary, high school, and college	12.2
Junior high, high school, and college	12.2
Elementary, junior high, high school, and college	16.3

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

All but 10 percent of the teachers had taught in multiple educational settings, and approximately 95 percent had worked in a high school. The table also indicates that the teachers had generally worked with older students rather than very young ones. None of the teachers had come into high school teaching directly from elementary school teaching, even though many of them (about 40 percent) had had some experience working in that setting—about the same percentage as had worked with junior high and high school students. Teachers had more experience working with college students—about 70 percent.

All the data indicate that these are *not* inexperienced teachers. They may be inexperienced in teaching in an American high school; they may be inexperienced in teaching Chinese—either generally, or to students who are not ethnic Chinese. But they do bring a great deal, and a great variety, of experience to the classroom. In short, the stereotype of the inexperienced Chinese high school teacher is only a partially accurate representation of the reality. What initially appears to be "inexperience" is better conceived of as a process of becoming—evidence of a profession in search of agreed-upon standards for teacher qualifications and program components.

Upgrading and Maintaining Teacher Skills

One of the main underpinnings of the Dodge Chinese Initiative was the sponsorship of several teacher training workshops. Thirty-five of the teachers, or slightly over 70 percent, attended at least one workshop; most attended more than one. Not all the workshops stressed the same activity. Two of them—Hawaii (1987) and Northfield Mount Hermon (1989)—were organized and run by the high school teachers themselves through the Chinese Language Association for Secondary Schools (CLASS). One workshop was held in Beijing. There were also four workshops held in conjunction with the Middlebury Summer Language Program in Chinese, one of which was held while this survey was being conducted.

Teachers were asked to recall these workshops and to indicate how useful they were. Table 3.10 presents the mean ranking of each workshop on a four-point scale, with the higher number indicating a greater level of utility. A rating of 4.0 would indicate a totally useful workshop, and a rating of 1.0 a totally useless one.

Table 3.10: Mean Utility of Teacher Workshops (percent)

Workshop	Utility
Ohio State (summer '84)	3.73
Middlebury (summer '85)	3.63
Beijing (summer '86)	3.38
Middlebury (summer '86)	3.20
Hawaii (summer '87)	3.58
Middlebury (summer '88)	3.29

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

As the table shows, the teachers gave all the workshops quite high overall ratings. For the most part, the workshops focused on teaching materials and how to use them (particularly *The Chinese Primer,* the textbook underwritten by the Dodge Foundation for use by high school students), Chinese linguistics, and the principles of language teaching. Table 3.11 indicates what the teachers thought about these specific activities—which ones they found most useful and which ones they felt should be emphasized more (or less) in future workshops. The areas they were asked to rate were derived from proposals to the Dodge Foundation for support of the workshops and final reports on the workshops returned to the foundation. A number of the workshops gave special attention to introducing *The Chinese Primer* to teachers and demonstrating its classroom use; for that reason it has been included as one of the items to be rated. Again, teachers were asked to indicate the utility of each activity on a scale ranging from 1.0 to 5.0, with a higher rating indicating greater utility. The table has been constructed to highlight the areas teachers felt should be emphasized most in future workshops, listed in descending order of importance. The numbers in parentheses represent the rank ordering of the utility of the activities in past workshops.

Table 3.11: Mean Utility of Activities at Past Workshops and Desired Emphasis for Future Ones (percent)

Activity	Past Workshops	Future Workshops
Classroom teaching techniques	(5) 3.47	4.80
Sharing materials and experiences	(1) 4.26	4.78
Developing supplementary materials	(7.5) 3.39	4.63
Teaching for proficiency	(15) 1.23	4.41
Program development	(11) 2.68	4.38
Using instructional materials	(3) 3.67	4.38
Teaching the spoken language	(7.5) 3.39	4.26
Managing a Chinese program	(12) 2.66	4.26
Techniques for testing and evaluation	(13) 2.52	4.24
Working with American students	(6) 3.40	4.20
Teaching Chinese culture	(14) 2.34	3.85
Pros and cons of different textbooks	(10) 2.84	3.80
Teaching the written language	(9) 3.00	3.65
Teaching grammar	(2) 3.76	3.53
Introducing *The Chinese Primer*	(4) 3.54	1.89

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The first three items on this list—classroom teaching techniques, sharing materials and experiences, and developing supplementary materials—form one grouping of particular importance to these teachers. The teachers are all generally concerned with the lack of teaching materials and with the difficulty of communicating effectively with high school students. What was most evident at the Northfield Mount Hermon meeting was that teachers are actively looking for materials developed by other teachers that they too can use. Aware of the difficulty of teaching Chinese with its character-based reading and writing system and its tonal sound system, they are all also groping for better teaching methods. The high ranking assigned to "sharing materials and experiences"—the number one position in terms of utility of past workshops, and the number two position in terms of emphasis for future ones—indicates its importance to teachers: their active search for better methods of working with high school students, and their need to network among themselves and to reaffirm that they have a useful role to play. As many of them indicated, this is their only opportunity to attend a meeting of foreign language teachers and find anybody to talk to other than French, German, Latin, and Spanish teachers—whose problems and solutions are of only tangential interest to the Chinese teachers, except for setting overall program goals.

Permanence of Appointment

Another indicator of professionalization is the type of teaching contract held. A teacher can be part-time or full-time, and can hold an annual, multi-year, or permanent contract. Across the American school system, it is probably most common for teachers to have annual contracts that are renewed pro forma, except when there are across-the-board reductions in faculty or in extraordinary cases of a teacher's failure to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the position. Table 3.12 shows the distribution of Chinese teachers in terms of the type of employment contracts they hold within their school systems.

Table 3.12: Distribution of Teachers by Type of Employment Contract (percent)

Type of Contract	Part Time	Full Time	Total
Annual	31.3	41.7	73.0
Multi-year	2.1	2.1	4.2
Permanent position	0.0	22.8	22.8
Total	33.4	66.6	100.0

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The table demonstrates that most Chinese teachers are employed on the same basis as most other teachers—under an annual contract. It illustrates the growing strength of the Chinese teachers in that most of them have full-time or permanent positions in their schools. Principals were asked the same question regarding the type of teaching contract held by the Chinese teachers. The only difference between the two sets of responses was that whereas the teachers perceived themselves as holding permanent positions, the principals perceived them as holding multi-year contracts. The principals' perception is probably more accurate. No principal stated that a teacher held a permanent position; but it is likely that teachers perceive "multi-year" and "permanent" to be equivalent. Overall, two-thirds of the teachers are employed full-time and one-third part-time. Again, the types of teaching contracts that the Chinese language teachers hold suggest that they are moving well along on that continuum from cottage industry to full profession.

Certification

A final measure of professionalization is certification or credentialing by state departments of education. A teacher with certification is assumed to have achieved a certain level of mastery of the subject matter, skill in presenting the subject matter to students, and knowledge of appropriate educational theories. For teachers in private schools, such a certificate is normally not essential. For teachers in public schools, it is a necessity. Most states, however, provide a mechanism whereby teachers can be temporarily certified because of shortages, special skills, and the like. This mechanism has often been used to credential teachers of Chinese and of other less commonly taught languages. The need for such a bypass mechanism becomes apparent when one realizes that in 1991 only eighteen states had a procedure whereby a teacher could become certified specifically to teach Chinese. Additionally, only twenty states mention specific colleges and universities offering teacher training programs for Chinese.[6] Requirements vary by state, but certification requirements usually include taking a particular set of courses in the language or having comparable proficiency (normally this implies native-speaker knowledge or college coursework equivalent to a minor in the language); a set of courses in educational theory and psychology, including at least one course on how to teach a foreign language (no state specifies a course on how to teach Chinese or any less commonly taught language); and courses that are idiosyncratic to each state such as state history, health issues, and so on. The fact that fewer than half of the states recognize the need to develop guidelines for credentialing teachers in Chinese indicates the low level of professionalization and the lack of pressure in the states to raise that level.

To put the credentialing problem into perspective, let it be noted that the public school principals reported that at least 75 percent of the faculty are certified teachers, while fewer than half of the private schools reported having that large a percentage of certified teachers. (In public schools nationally, 93.3 percent of all teachers are certified in their primary field, while 66.2 percent are certified in their secondary field.[7]) Sixty percent of all Chinese teachers in the Dodge high schools have a teaching certificate. While most of those working in the public school system have teaching certificates (68 percent), only a small portion of those working in private schools are certified (31 percent). Again, remember that the certificate to teach is not necessarily a certificate for teaching either Chinese specifically or foreign languages generally. From a broad perspective, then, teachers of Chinese do generally hold teaching certificates—but the proportion is below the national average, and the certification is not necessarily to teach Chinese.

---

[6] Survey of state foreign language supervisors undertaken by the National Foreign Language Center in the spring and fall of 1991.

[7] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education, 1991*, vol. 1, *Elementary and Secondary Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991), p. 100.

Table 3.13 illustrates the certification picture by comparing the Chinese teachers in Dodge schools with those in non-Dodge schools, and with foreign language teachers generally. Again, the data were collected in somewhat different fashions. Teachers in the Dodge schools were asked not about permanent versus temporary certification, but rather about whether they had any kind of certification in any subject, and whether they were particularly certified in Chinese.

Table 3.13: Certification of Chinese Language Teachers in Dodge and Non-Dodge Schools and of Other Foreign Language Teachers (percent)

	Chinese Language Teachers		
Certification	**Dodge High Schools**	**Non-Dodge High Schools**	**Other Language Teachers**
Permanent certificate	—	49.6	66.1
Temporary certificate	—	28.6	6.1
No certificate	—	21.8	13.9
Not reported	—	—	13.9
Certified in something	81.3	—	—
Certified in Chinese	58.3	—	—

Source: Teacher's questionnaire; non-Dodge survey; U.S. Department of Education, "School and Staffing Survey, 1988."

There is no great difference in certification between the Dodge-school teachers who are native Chinese speakers (57.1 percent) and those who are native English speakers (61.5 percent). The data also suggest that the level of certification is about the same for Dodge and non-Dodge teachers. The more interesting comparison is between non-Dodge Chinese teachers and other foreign language teachers who have temporary certificates. The proportion of non-Dodge Chinese teachers having temporary certificates is over four times that of foreign language teachers generally. In other words, while Chinese teachers may have a teaching certificate—the law in most states requires it—the certification process is truncated; they have not passed through the educational process by which certification is normally acquired.

Subject Specialization

One last indicator of professionalization is subject specialization. Can Chinese language teachers concentrate on teaching only their specialty, or are they required to teach a variety of subjects? If they have to teach several subjects, to what extent are those second subjects related to their specialty? Fifty-five percent of the teachers indicate that they were currently teaching a second subject. Table 3.14 shows the distribution of subjects.

Table 3.14: Distribution of Secondary Subjects Taught by Chinese Teachers

Subject	Percent
Other foreign languages, including ESL	35
Asian and/or Chinese studies	31
History	12
English	8
Physical education	8
Science and/or mathematics	3
Elementary school	3

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

Two-thirds to three-fourths of the second subjects being taught can easily be considered to be related to the Chinese language program. Specifically, foreign languages and English as a Second Language (ESL) involve foreign language teaching skills, while Asian and/or Chinese studies complement the cultural component of foreign language instruction. In cases where world literatures or world cultures are included in an English course, English might also be seen as related to the study of Chinese, at least in the high school setting.

Summary

Given the quantum jump in the demand for teachers of Chinese that resulted from the Dodge Chinese Initiative, one might expect to find schools hiring young, inexperienced teachers having a marginal place in the teaching profession. But in fact, the principals reported little difficulty in finding qualified teachers for the jobs. The teachers in these programs are actually more mature than most high school teachers. True, many of these teachers are certified in subjects other than teaching of the Chinese language, and some have yet to be certified at all; and the permanence of their appointments is often in some doubt. However, high school Chinese teachers are well on their way toward full professionalization. And throughout the survey it was clear that the teacher was the most important element in the success of a program.

The next chapter will discuss the content of the instruction that takes place in the high school Chinese classroom.

Chapter Four

The Content of Instruction

One of the early decisions made by the Dodge Foundation was to restrict instruction in Chinese to Mandarin, a choice following common American educational practice.[1] Choosing which Chinese language to teach is perhaps the easiest decision to make. Beyond that, there are many other decisions for which other languages provide few guidelines and consensus among teachers of Chinese is limited. Teachers of French, German, Latin, or Spanish have a fairly clear idea of what a first-, second-, or third-year class of students should be learning, as well as what they should be able to accomplish in the language. This is not true for teachers of Chinese. Each teacher is in the process of defining just what students at each level should be doing. There are few guides to assist them in developing their individual curricula.[2] Textbooks can help; so can workshops and the advice of other foreign language teachers. But for the most part teachers are left to their own devices in designing their curricula. And the wealth of instructional materials available to the teacher of a European language does not exist for the high school teacher of Chinese.

This chapter will examine the instructional issues raised by some of the unique features of Chinese. What skills should be introduced first and emphasized most? How many and what types of Chinese characters should students learn? What transcription system should be used? What grammatical features should be introduced, and when? What is the appropriate mix and timing for providing background in Chinese culture?

The Choice of Mandarin

What is often termed "the Chinese language" is in fact only one of several Chinese languages. Most linguists identify at least six different Chinese languages: Mandarin,

---

[1] Of the 7,354 students studying Chinese in high schools in the United States in 1990, only 616 were studying Cantonese. See Jamie B. Draper, *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 1989 & Fall 1990* (Yonkers, N.Y.: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, October 1991).

[2] Recently, there has been an attempt by a group of teachers of Chinese at the high school level to develop a consensus curricular model. See Chinese Language Association for Secondary Schools, "Guidelines for Chinese Language Teaching in Secondary Schools" (document produced by high school teachers at a workshop held at the National Foreign Language Center, October 1990; available at the Secondary School Chinese Language Center, East Asian Studies Department, Princeton University).

Cantonese, Wu, Hakka, Min, and Gan-Xiang. While the word *dialect* has often been used to label these various versions of Chinese, there has been a shift away from this sort of classification, since these "dialects" can differ from one another as much as European languages do. John DeFrancis, a prominent Chinese language specialist, has coined the term *regionalect* and suggests the following classification: Mandarin, Wu, Cantonese, Hakka, Xiang, Gan, Northern Min, and Southern Min.[3]

Mandarin is the official language of China for purposes of cross-regional communication, and it is the native language of an estimated 70 percent of the population. It is also the official language of Taiwan (where a sizable number of the population nevertheless speak a variety of Southern Min, usually just called Taiwanese, as a first language). Given the official status of Mandarin as a lingua franca in both China and Taiwan, as well as the large number of native speakers of Mandarin, it is natural to regard it as the most important and most useful Chinese language for foreigners to learn. For this reason, it is common in American educational settings to use the term *Chinese* interchangeably with *Mandarin*. High school and college courses are listed as "Chinese"; students say that they are taking "Chinese"; teachers are known as "Chinese teachers" and say that they teach "Chinese."

The various Chinese languages differ most in their sound systems and somewhat in their high-frequency, everyday vocabulary. There are also differences, though not overwhelming ones, in their grammatical systems.[4] The differences in sound systems and everyday vocabulary are definitely enough to prevent communication between speakers of the various Chinese languages, as a brief visit to Hong Kong's Kai Tak Airport will reveal; one has only to observe Mandarin speakers deplaning and encountering Cantonese-speaking redcaps and taxi drivers. On the other hand, speakers of all Chinese languages generally use the same basic set of characters for the written language. A Cantonese speaker can therefore read *The People's Daily*, which is produced in Beijing by Mandarin speakers. However, if this same Cantonese speaker were to read an article from that newspaper over the phone back to its Mandarin-speaking author, the author would probably not understand it, because the Cantonese speaker would be reading the characters using the Cantonese pronunciation system.

Beyond the linguistic features of the language, another rationale for recognizing an overall Chinese language is that there is a common cultural and historical bond that posits China as one country. One country, ethnically homogeneous, is normally assumed to have one language. For instance, in Western Europe it is fairly common to associate a language with a country, even though this is not entirely accurate and certainly does not describe the situation in Eastern Europe. The automatic extension is that if people in France speak French, then people in China speak "Chinese."

While it is common practice to use the terms *Chinese* and *Mandarin* interchangeably, it is important to remember that technically, Mandarin is only one of the Chinese languages.

---

[3] John DeFrancis, *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984), pp. 60–64.

[4] This description of Chinese (or Mandarin) is meant to characterize the language in a meaningful way for the nonlinguist/nonspecialist rather than to serve as a linguistic analysis.

If instruction in Cantonese, for example, were to become widespread in American educational systems, the term *Mandarin* would no doubt replace the generic term *Chinese* in order to ensure that these two different languages were accurately and consistently distinguished.

Skill Sequencing and Emphasis

One of the first choices a teacher must make is when and how to introduce each of the four skills—speaking, listening, reading, and writing. While teachers of the Western European languages may differ on how much to emphasize oral versus written skills, the uniformity of these languages' writing systems makes for a relatively easy transition from one to the other. Since it is considerably more difficult for Americans to learn the Chinese orthographic system—and there are heavy demands on teachers' time in getting students to master it—the teacher of Chinese must make a much more deliberate choice as to skill sequencing and emphasis.

How much agreement is there in practice on this important curricular decision? To answer this question, the teachers were asked to report the relative emphasis they placed on speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Table 4.1 shows the average emphasis the teachers reported placing on each skill at each level of Chinese.

Table 4.1: Mean Emphasis Placed on Each Skill at Each Level of Chinese Instruction (percent)

Skill	Exploring Chinese	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	Pre-Int'l. Bacc.
Speaking	37	34	33	28	29	28
Listening	30	28	25	24	22	23
Reading	15	19	21	24	26	23
Writing	18	19	21	24	23	26

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

Most courses are identified in the table by year level. However, some schools offer either a preparatory course with a heavy emphasis on Chinese culture or a more advanced course designed to incorporate language learning into a more substantive context. "Exploring Chinese" describes a preparatory course—lasting from part of a term to a full year—that gives students, usually in junior high school, a general introduction to the structure of the language and the culture of the people who speak it. It might be described as a "prelanguage" course. It is not designed to give students an in-depth knowledge of Chinese or any real skills beyond a few simple patterns, a small vocabulary, maybe a song or two and a few politeness phrases. The theory is that students will be more inclined to enroll in a language when they enter high school if they are exposed to it at an early age and in a nonthreatening way. Such courses are intended to give students a sufficient sense of one language or a variety of languages for them to make informed decisions about which one to study in high school.[5]

The Pre–International Baccalaureate program is organized much like the courses in levels 1 through 4/5, except that there is a greater emphasis on writing than in the normal sequence of instruction, and culture is given a more pronounced role. Since only two teachers who responded were involved with Pre-International Baccalaureate programs, it is difficult to develop an elaborate differentiation between that sort of program and the normal sequential high school language courses.

Table 4.1 describes the proportion of classroom time at each level that is allocated to acquiring the various linguistic skills. In the early years most teachers put the greatest emphasis on speaking and, to a lesser extent, listening. This emphasis on the oral skills parallels the preference of teachers of other languages as well. Since the 1960s high school language instruction has increasingly tended to put more emphasis on listening and speaking than on reading and writing. Chinese language teachers are particularly inclined to postpone reading and writing until later years because of the special problems of Chinese orthography (discussed below).

By the third year all four of the skills are getting nearly equal attention. This shifting emphasis results in a very heavy expenditure of time (almost half of the classroom session in upper-level courses) on the development of reading and writing skills, and the bulk of that time is spent on character recognition and reproduction—not on reading literature, as might be the case at the equivalent level in a Western European language. For a commonly taught language, such an increased emphasis on reading as the level advanced might mean that students were reading Molière, Goethe, or Cervantes or learning the appropriate styles for writing formal and informal letters, essays, and other expository forms.

This is far from the case in Chinese, where it has been estimated that a *native* Chinese requires a knowledge of twelve hundred to two thousand characters to approach even a *minimal* reading ability. While one character may represent one word, most words in Chinese are composed of two or more characters in combination. A native Chinese speaker knows thousands of words in speech and can quickly puzzle out the meaning of a word composed of compound characters, if he or she knows each character. A native speaker of English, or of another language not based on the Chinese character writing system, would need to know the same rough range of characters (twelve hundred to two thousand) to approach a minimal reading ability. However, even if the English speaker could recognize that many characters, there is no guarantee that he or she could recognize a word composed of two or three of those characters. For example, the English-speaking student might recognize the character *zhòng* (heavy) as well as the character *yaò* (to want, to need) but would not necessarily know that the compound word *zhòng-yaò* means "important" unless *zhòng-yaò* were already incorporated into the student's speaking vocabulary. In short, the English-speaking student faces enormous hurdles in developing the requisite skills for "decoding and reading" even the simplest contemporary written prose, and true reading of complex contemporary literary texts or historical documents is a skill that takes years to master. Most students in the fourth year are still struggling with that basic set of characters needed for minimal literacy in Chinese.

---

[5] There are no data in this survey or elsewhere about how many students enrolled in such preparatory courses do in fact go further in the study of Chinese.

While the high school Chinese teachers' emphasis on speaking and listening mirrors the pattern common to language instruction more generally, it does not represent a direct borrowing from practice in other languages. Chinese teachers would never confuse what they do in teaching reading and writing with what goes on in an equivalent lesson in a course in, say, French. Indeed, one of the issues of general interest in the survey was the extent to which the Chinese teachers deliberately modeled their work on instructional practices in French, German, and Spanish. To shed light on this issue, the Chinese teachers were asked if the skill emphasis in their Chinese classrooms was different from that of other foreign language teachers. Almost 60 percent of the teachers said that they did not have any idea of how much emphasis other teachers placed on each of the four skills. The remainder were almost equally divided between those feeling that they did differ in emphasis from other foreign language teachers and those feeling that they did not. When asked what the differences were, the Chinese teachers quite naturally pointed to the difficult and time-consuming task of teaching characters, as well as the time spent developing oral skills and making the connections between character recognition and vocal recognition. Others felt that they did not spend as much time on writing as their colleagues in Western European languages because of the innate difficulty of working with a character-based language. Others felt that they spent more time teaching communicative skills, "especially in the first two years." In short, for the minority of teachers who were certain that their emphases were different from those of other foreign language teachers, they believed that it was the nature of the Chinese writing system, in particular the character-based orthography, that made it necessary to organize their instructional program somewhat differently.

The Chinese Writing System

The Chinese writing system is perhaps unique among the world's languages. In order to convey even a rough idea of how this system works, it is necessary to touch upon a few linguistic concepts. Technically, the smallest unit of meaning in any language is not the word but the morpheme. For example, the English word *books* is one word, but it consists of two morphemes: *book* (referring to that thing in print that one reads) and *-s* (indicating "plural" or "more than one"). In the Chinese writing system, each morpheme is represented by a Chinese character. Many "words" in Chinese consist of only one morpheme and thus of only one character. However, the majority of words in Chinese are made up of more than one morpheme, and thus more than one character. At the same time, with some rare exceptions each morpheme corresponds to one syllable. Thus, we have the typical formula that a syllable (the smallest unit of pronunciation) corresponds to a morpheme (the smallest unit of meaning) corresponds to a character in the Chinese writing system.

What exactly is a Chinese character graphically? A character is a combination of strokes written in a prescribed order. A stroke, in turn, is what one writes before lifting up the writing instrument. For example, the letter *H* in the English alphabet consists of three strokes—two vertical and one horizontal. However, English writers can vary the order in which they write the strokes of the *H* without affecting its recognizability. Some may write the two vertical strokes before writing the horizontal stroke, whereas others may write the left vertical stroke, then the horizonal stroke, and finally the right vertical stroke. In Chinese there is no such option for variety. Every character in Chinese must be written according to a strict order that all learners memorize. Knowledge of stroke order not only promotes fast writing (writing a character the same way each time helps instill automaticity) but is important in other ways as well (such knowledge is often required for looking up characters in a dictionary). The number of strokes in a Chinese character can range from one up to seventy-four.

Are Chinese characters simply drawings that must be mastered, much as wiring diagrams are memorized, or is there some system or structure to the composition of characters? Early Chinese characters were intended to be pictures of something, and many people still assume that all Chinese characters are such pictograms. However, from these early origins character writing evolved to the point where ideally one component of the character gave a hint as to the character's meaning and another gave a hint as to its pronunciation. These so-called phonetic compounds now account for approximately 90 percent of Chinese characters; contrary to popular belief, only 5 percent of currently used characters are the famous pictograms.

However, the phonetic-compound system is quite imperfect. Oftentimes the two components give no hints about meaning or pronunciation at all. In fact, it is impossible for a native Chinese speaker to be sure of either the meaning or the pronunciation of a character he or she has never before encountered. As a consequence of this writing system, the meaning and pronunciation of each character must simply be memorized. While there may be ways to speed up the process, memorization is simply a fact of life. Moreover, knowing one character does not help a student learn a second; knowing one hundred does not appreciably increase the pace of learning two hundred; and while there are tricks that students can learn to make this daunting task easier, the task remains essentially similar to moving a cemetery—one form at a time.

It should be quickly added that teaching students to write the characters is not all there is to learning to write Chinese. For one thing, there is an enormous difference between recognizing characters and words—that is, recalling the meaning and pronunciation of the written symbols—and producing the written symbols from memory. Chinese themselves rarely have trouble recognizing the written symbols but frequently forget how to write them. One hears many stories of long-term visitors from China having their letters home returned by the recipients with every writing error circled, accompanied by a stern warning not to forget their native language.

In addition, writing in Chinese, as in any language, requires much more than the ability to produce written symbols from memory. Since the Chinese written language can differ dramatically from the spoken language, the learner must learn the rhetorical and stylistic devices characteristic of the Chinese written language as well as the structure of the language and its word-symbol relationships. The native Chinese speaker, like the native English speaker, starts with a knowledge of the spoken language but then must learn, through years of formal schooling, to convert that knowledge into a formal written medium that is much more than just "speech written down." The native English speaker learning to write Chinese, however, does not start learning to read or write with the deep knowledge of the spoken language that a Chinese first-grader brings to the task. The native English speaker is trying to learn the spoken language and the written language simultaneously, and thus faces a much greater task than that Chinese first-grader. Moreover, whereas the native English speaker studying French or Spanish is greatly assisted by the phonetically based alphabetic systems of those languages, the student of Chinese, even if he or she does know how to say something, must still convert that knowledge into an essentially nonphonetic written form—the Chinese characters.

It is not surprising, therefore, that much of the emphasis in both high schools and colleges in teaching students to read and write Chinese centers on the learning and memorization of characters. It is not unusual for a sequence of study to be defined, as regards work on the written language, by the number of characters to be mastered. This is also thought to be some measure of comparison across programs: a program either does or does not teach enough characters. In reality, the mastery of character recognition and production is a necessary—but far from sufficient—condition for reading and writing in Chinese. In view of the special problems inherent in teaching the Chinese writing system, the survey paid a great deal of attention to this aspect of instruction.

Teaching Characters

Unlike learners of French or Spanish, students beginning the study of Chinese know nothing about how to read and write Chinese—less than almost any American child would know about how to read and write English upon beginning kindergarten or first grade. This task is made more difficult by the fact that a teacher must decide which of two systems of characters to use—simplified or traditional. One of the educational reforms implemented in China during the Cultural Revolution was the introduction of a system of simplified characters, an attempt to make literacy more accessible to the general population. For the foreign learner of the Chinese language, the consequence of this decision is that students interested in traditional and historical Chinese civilization find that almost all the materials they use are written in traditional characters. Modern materials are likely to be in simplified characters. To complicate matters further, character simplification did not extend beyond the boundaries of the People's Republic of China. The simplified character system is not used in Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, or other diaspora centers of Chinese population.

The difference between the two systems can be significant to the foreign learner. For example, the word meaning "cart, car, wheeled vehicle" requires three strokes in the simplified style but eight in the traditional style. The confusion this situation introduces for Chinese language teaching is illustrated in the curricular guideline principles recently issued by the Chinese Language Association for Secondary Schools: "While there is nearly complete agreement that a student will need to be able to use and to recognize both simplified and full form characters at some point . . . we have agreed that the teacher should have the option of using either system in [proficiency] levels one and two."[6]

In view of the centrality and complexity of teaching Chinese characters, the survey tried to explore current instructional practices in some depth. The Chinese high school teachers were asked which system they were using and how many characters students were supposed to be able to recognize and to produce at each level of instruction. Native-speaker teachers differed from their non-native counterparts in the choice between traditional and simplified characters. Hence, Table 4.2, which reports on which systems teachers used in their programs, presents the responses of the two groups both separately and combined.

---

[6] CLASS, "Guidelines for Chinese Language Teaching in Secondary Schools."

Table 4.2: Percentage of Teachers Using Simplified or Traditional Chinese Character System

System	Native Chinese Speakers	Native English Speakers	All Teachers
Simplified only	14.7	0.0	10.6
Traditional only	38.2	61.5	44.7
Simplified and traditional	47.1	38.5	44.7
Number of teachers	34	13	47

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The difference between the preferences of native Chinese and native English speakers is clear. However, the difference is opposite to what might have been expected. Native English speakers are more likely to teach only the traditional characters. Native Chinese speakers, some of whom were recently educated in the People's Republic of China and would have been taught this way themselves, are the only ones who teach only the simplified characters. Native Chinese speakers are almost twice as likely as native English speakers to use the simplified character system. Many teach both systems. More generally, however, teachers are basically agreed upon teaching their high school students the traditional system of characters—almost 90 percent of them teach that system, at least part of the time. When teachers indicated on the questionnaire that they used both systems, many said that they gave students only a passing familiarity with one of the systems—usually simplified. In practice, teachers in high school are predominantly teaching their students the traditional system, while fewer than half are giving some instruction in both systems.

Number of Characters Learned

Whichever system of characters is chosen, progress in reading and writing Chinese is generally measured in terms of how many characters the student has mastered, although some teachers pointed out the obvious fact that being able to decode characters is not the same as being able to read or to produce them. We specifically asked the teachers to distinguish between recognition and production. The one point of agreement that emerged is that students are generally expected to be able to recognize more characters than they can produce. Table 4.3 shows the average number of characters that teachers expect students to be able to recognize and to produce at each level of instruction and for each system of characters.

Table 4.3: Mean Number of Characters Students Are Expected to Recognize and Produce

	Simplified	Traditional
Able to recognize		
Level 1	208	191
Level 2	275	382
Level 3	395	620
Level 4	613	869
Able to produce		
Level 1	138	132
Level 2	191	275
Level 3	308	417
Level 4	483	548

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

At level 1, teachers expect about the same level of performance by students whether they are teaching the simplified character system or the traditional one. Interestingly, however, as one moves to each subsequent level of Chinese, those teaching the traditional system expect their students to learn more characters than do those working with the simplified system. This difference is somewhat greater in terms of the number of characters students are expected to be able to recognize; the difference is a bit less for the number they are expected to be able to produce.

Aside from the matter of the two different character sets, what Table 4.3 shows is that the mastery of characters is quite gradual. It is true that compared with the speed with which the American first-grader can master the twenty-six letters of the English alphabet, learning more than a hundred new Chinese characters per year is quite a feat. It is also true that since there are several thousand characters to learn, progress is painfully slow and incomplete.

In a way, the averages presented in Table 4.3 are deceiving. In few other aspects of instruction is the degree of disagreement in pedagogical goals quite as great as in the number of characters different teachers expect their students to learn. Table 4.4 shows the absolute range in the number of characters taught by different teachers at each level.

Table 4.4: Range of Characters Taught

	Simplified	Traditional
Able to recognize		
Level 1	30–500	50–500
Level 2	30–650	100–800
Level 3	50–2,000 (a)	100–2,000 (c)
Level 4	60–3,000 (b)	150–3,000 (d)
Able to produce		
Level 1	30–400	25–500
Level 2	20–400	45–700
Level 3	30–800	40–1,200 (e)
Level 4	40–1,200 (g)	75–1,800 (f)

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The table vividly illustrates the lack of agreement on curricular goals. Obviously, what we see here when we look at the extremes are two types of programs—one in which the writing system is singularly unimportant, and another in which it is the program's driving force. Most teachers view the upper-limit claims in levels 3 and 4 in some high schools with a great deal of skepticism, but these figures do indicate that several of the programs that give special emphasis to reading and writing do feel that their students' mastery of characters is a quantum step beyond what has been achieved in other programs. One school placed an unusual emphasis on teaching characters, as indicated by the letters *a* through *f.* If that school were excluded, the next highest numbers reported would be as follows: *a,* 900; *b,* 1,300; *c,* 1,200; *d,* 2,000; *e,* 850; and *f,* 1,000. One other school emphasized producing simplified characters at the fourth level more than other schools and is indicated by the letter *g;* students in that school were expected to be able to produce four hundred more characters than other students at that level. The low end of the range at each level for teachers using the simplified system reflects the fact that some teachers are giving students an introduction to the simplified system at higher levels but are not stressing acquisition. Again, with teachers using the traditional system, some do not stress the ability to write as much as others do.

Even more remarkable, however, is the fact that some teachers expect their students to be able to recognize ten times the number of characters as other teachers at the same level expect. At level 4, students of the teacher requiring the ability to produce the largest number of traditional characters are expected to produce twenty-four times as many characters as the students of the teacher requiring the fewest number of characters, and the difference is even greater if we are looking at simplified characters—thirty times as many. The lack of consensus on the number of characters to be learned (to be able to produce) is greatest among teachers using traditional characters at the advanced level. The highest number of characters expected to be learned (1,800) is three times as high as the average (548), which in turn is over seven times the requirement at the lower end of the range (75). These are not small differences, and they represent major variations in teaching style and in program organization. At levels 3 and 4, one or two schools demand much more of their students than others do. It is true that few teachers set these very high standards, but theirs are among the more admired programs.

To what extent do these differences in the demands made on students to learn characters reflect different views of native Chinese and English speakers? The folklore holds that native Chinese speakers place greater emphasis on learning to write Chinese as opposed to speaking it. As discussed earlier, when looking at the overall difference in emphasis between the two sets of teachers, the native Chinese speakers did give writing a statistically significant greater emphasis than speakers of English did. This greater emphasis, however, was not significant at every level of instruction. Similarly, the data on the number of characters teachers expect students to learn do not support the folklore. The difference between the mean number of characters that students taught by native Chinese speakers are expected to know and the mean number that those taught by non-native speakers are expected to know is statistically insignificant at each level of instruction, regardless of which character system is being taught. Native speakers of Chinese and native speakers of English have similar expectations as to the number of characters they expect their students to learn. The wide range of expectations seen in Table 4.4 is evidence of a much more general lack of consensus on curricular matters than any differences dictated by the mother tongue of the teacher.

Phonetic Transcription Systems

Imagine trying to learn a new dialogue in Mandarin each day. It is certainly possible to do so just by listening to a teacher or by using tapes. However, for practice without the teacher or tape, it is convenient to have some written record of speech. If this record takes the form of Chinese characters and the student has not yet memorized what all the characters mean and how they are pronounced, he or she will have no sure way of knowing either the meaning or the pronunciation of the dialogue. In this approach, the only way to learn spoken Chinese is by first learning how to read the characters. While perhaps logical, such a process is certainly not efficient; consider DeFrancis's observation that while learning to speak Chinese is only slightly more difficult than learning to speak French, learning to read Chinese is five times more difficult than learning to read French.[7] Must learners first tackle the five-times-harder task of reading Chinese in order to have a usable written record of speech? Interestingly, many inexperienced teachers and tutors of Chinese do begin instruction in Chinese by working first—and often exclusively—on the mastery of characters as a means of introducing the spoken language.

Fortunately, there is an alternative way of representing speech—through the use of transcription systems. Such systems use particular symbols to represent the sounds of the language; that is, they are phonetic in nature. Among the most widely used phonetic transcription systems for Chinese are what are termed romanization systems, so designated because the sounds of Mandarin are represented by the letters of the Roman alphabet. Much confusion arises, however, about what a romanization system is and what it should be used for. Let us clear up some of the misconceptions.

First, romanization systems are not meant to be substitutes for characters when it comes to reading and writing the authentic language. They are intended only to provide a written record of speech that is easier to work with than Chinese characters, which are poor indicators of pronunciation. Second, there is no transcription system in existence that is somehow "self-pronouncing." The use of any transcription system requires that the learner memorize an arbitrary relationship between a written symbol and the sound it represents. (This is true as well for alphabetic writing systems, such as English.) Third, it is impossible for a transcription system to "cause" poor pronunciation, for transcriptions do not speak: they are silent written symbols. Sounds are learned from people; they are represented phonetically by written squiggles. The learner must memorize which squiggle stands for which sound.

The transcription system most widely used in Chinese instructional materials in the United States is pin-yin. (In pin-yin, the Mandarin word for *new* is represented as *xīn* and the word for *often* as *cháng*.) This is currently the official transcription system in use in the People's Republic of China. It is used at the elementary level for all speakers of Mandarin as well as for teaching Mandarin to speakers of other Chinese languages.

An older system, Wade-Giles, is most likely not now used in instructional materials, though it is used in older dictionaries and in Chinese library collections and card catalogues in the United States. (In the Wade-Giles system, *new* would be represented as *hsīn* and *often* as *ch'áng*.) Yet another system, the National Romanization system—commonly abbreviated

---

[7] DeFrancis, *The Chinese Language*, p. 52.

GR—is used in some text materials. (In GR, *new* becomes *shīn* and *often* becomes *charng.*) American language specialists have developed still another system, the Yale Romanization system, in an effort to employ symbols that would be easier for native English speakers to master and use. (In the Yale system, *new* is represented as *syīn* and *often* as *cháng.*)

The official transcription system used in Taiwan is not a romanization system at all, since it does not use alphabetic symbols. This system uses a set of nonalphabetic symbols to represent the initial, medial, and final sound of each syllable. This National Phonetic Symbols system—generally referred to as Bo-Po-Mo-Fo, after the names of the first four symbols in the system—is used in some instructional programs in the United States, usually by teachers trained in Taiwan.

One of the curiosities of transcription systems is the tendency for Chinese language educators to prefer one system over the others without any resort to empirical research indicating that Americans "learn better" with one system than another. The decision as to which transcription system to use is largely determined by the preference of each individual teacher, and the general rule is that most teachers prefer to use the system in which their initial training took place. If more than one system was used in their training, the first system learned is typically preferred to those introduced later.

Adherents of the National Phonetic Symbols system, Bo-Po-Mo-Fo, claim that it is best because it does not use alphabetic symbols. The logic presented to support this system is that English-speaking students will give alphabetic symbols their English rather than their Chinese pronunciation values. This claim is correct except that it is not based on a problem with alphabetic transcription systems—all transcription systems have arbitrary sound-symbol relationships—but rather concerns how the system is learned and taught. Proponents of the National Romanization system, GR, prefer it because the tone is spelled into the romanized word rather than being represented by a diacritical mark placed above the syllable to indicate the tone. The logic presented to support this system is that students tend to remember the tone of a syllable better when it is spelled into the word with an alphabetic letter. Opponents believe that this system is too complex and burdensome to master and that students should be learning tones primarily through speech, not visual memorization. Still others prefer the Yale system because it was designed exclusively for English-speaking learners and is therefore considered by its proponents to be somehow more direct in laying out sound-symbol relationships.

So far, these "logical" arguments have taken a back seat to the "force of numbers" argument. The pin-yin system is the official system of the People's Republic of China, a country whose population exceeds one billion. Moreover, textbooks and other classroom materials from China are now widely used in the United States—and all such materials use the pin-yin system for transcribing Mandarin speech.

Nevertheless, the survey shows that other systems are in use in American high school settings. The lack of agreement on transcription systems is not trivial. Some teachers have indicated that they prefer a certain set of text materials because of the transcription system used. This would imply that the choice of transcription system is seen as more important than pedagogical content. Some textbooks have been produced with versions in more than one transcription system, driving up development costs and no doubt complicating the inventory of distributors. In addition, students are sometimes fearful of having to learn a second transcription system when they shift educational settings. In any case, given the current array of text materials, dictionaries, library catalogues, and reference materials—all using different transcription systems—the advanced student of Chinese must ultimately become familiar with all the major systems, regardless of which one was used in his or her initial training.

In view of all this complexity, what transcription system do the high school teachers choose to teach? Since some teachers use more than one system, Table 4.5 presents the whole range of usage. Choices of transcription systems are among the differences in instructional style that clearly distinguish native-speaker teachers from non-native speakers. Hence, the table breaks the data down by the teachers' ethnic origins, showing the systems used by native Chinese speakers, by native English speakers, and by all teachers combined.

Table 4.5: Percentage of Teachers Using Each Transcription System

System	Native Chinese Speakers	Native English Speakers	All Teachers
Pin-yin	76.5	46.2	68.1
GR *	14.7	7.7	12.8
Yale	0.0	0.0	0.0
Bo-Po-Mo-Fo †	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pin-yin and GR	5.9	0.0	4.3
Pin-yin and Yale	2.9	15.4	6.4
Pin-yin and Bo-Po-Mo-Fo	0.0	7.7	2.1
Pin-yin, GR, and Bo-Po-Mo-Fo	0.0	7.7	2.1
Pin-yin, Yale, and Bo-Po-Mo-Fo	0.0	7.7	2.1
Pin-yin, GR, Yale, and Bo-Po-Mo-Fo	0.0	7.7	2.1
Number of teachers	35	13	48

* GR = National Romanization system.

† Bo-Po-Mo-Fo = National Phonetic Symbols system, which predominates in Taiwan.

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

What the table shows is that there is a great deal of agreement among teachers with regard to which transcription system to use in high school. Eighty-seven percent of the teachers teach their students to read pin-yin. Slightly over three-fourths of the native Chinese speakers use pin-yin as their only transcription system, while slightly under half of the native English speakers rely solely on pin-yin. No teacher uses only Yale or only Bo-Po-Mo-Fo. If a teacher instructs students in more than one transcription system, it is always pin-yin plus. Only native English speakers teach their students three (or four) systems. A few teachers switch transcription systems as students advance through the program. In short, pin-yin is clearly the high school transcription system of choice. This agreement in practice gained support in October 1990, when a group of high school Chinese language teachers from the Chinese Language Association for Secondary Schools (CLASS) met to develop curricular guidelines. They concluded that for teaching Chinese in the secondary schools, the "transcription systems will vary in level one. By the end of level two students will be able to read and write Hanyu Pinyin."[8] (In this case *level* indicates proficiency level, not academic level.)

Special Linguistic Features of Mandarin

Even if the student is able to master the daunting Chinese orthographic system, there remain all the other features of a foreign language to be learned. And unfortunately, neither the student's native language nor any other language he or she may have learned is likely to be of much help. A few general remarks may help explain the difficulties encountered in learning and teaching the Mandarin language system.

Sound System

In many ways the Mandarin sound system is quite simple. The basic unit of pronunciation is the syllable, and the Mandarin syllable structure is itself straightforward. Every syllable can be broken into an initial sound (either a single consonant or a vowel) and a final sound (consisting of a vowel, several vowels, or a vowel or vowel combination ending in *n* or *ng*). Some examples are *bã,*[9] *bái, ài, bàn,* and *bàng.* There are no consonant clusters. With some systematic exceptions, each syllable is overlaid with one of four tone or pitch contours: high-level tone, rising tone, dipping tone, or falling tone. The tone is an integral part of each syllable and helps convey the meaning of the syllable; a change in tone signals a change in meaning. For example, if the initial consonant of the English word *bet* is changed to *p,* resulting in *pet,* the meaning changes. Similarly, one of the meanings of the Mandarin combination *dã* with a dipping tone means "to strike," whereas one of the meanings of *dà* with a falling tone is "large."

Words and Word Formation

Words in Mandarin are made up of one syllable or a combination of syllables, with the majority of words consisting of two syllables: *dã* (dipping tone), "to strike"; *jīng* (high-level tone) + *jì* (falling tone), "economics." What is interesting about word formation in Mandarin—and in all Chinese languages—is that words are not changed in any form by grammatical function. In English, by contrast, endings such as the plural markers *-s* and *-es* can be added to nouns, just as *-d* and *-ed* can be added to verbs to signal past tense and so on. In Mandarin, nouns are not declined and verbs are not conjugated. Students studying French, German, or Spanish devote a considerable amount of time, effort, and energy to learning how to conjugate verbs, how to deal with irregular verbs, and how to add endings to nouns to indicate various grammatical functions.

---

[8] Ibid.

[9] The convention used in this text to represent the third (dipping) tone is the tilde. Pin-yin would use the breve—the symbol used in English dictionaries to represent a short vowel.

Sentence Structure

Mandarin, like Chinese languages generally, is usually described as a "word-order" language, meaning that grammatical notions such as subject, object, and verb are expressed by a word's position in the sentence rather than by word endings. Consider, for example, the sentence "The iggle sqigs geamed in the harlish goop." While the reader does not know the meaning of any of the content words in that sentence, it is fairly easy to identify the subject, the verb, and the object of the preposition, as well as which words are nouns, verbs, or adjectives, partially from word endings and partially from word order. Whereas meaning in English is conveyed by sentence position combined with other markers, Mandarin relies more on word order and less on other types of markers. This characterization of Mandarin as a word-order language is somewhat oversimplified, but compared with the European languages that most American students study, the generalization is fairly accurate.

The lack of endings attached to nouns, verbs, and other parts of speech and the word-order orientation of the Chinese languages often lead native Chinese speakers to claim that Chinese "has no grammar." Of course, to the native Chinese speaker learning a European language, this certainly seems to be the case. However, Chinese does have a grammar, and a rather complex one at that, but it works differently from grammar in European languages.

Linguistic Features Taught

As with decisions about the number of characters to be taught and the particular transcription system to be used, there is wide variation among teachers as to the specific linguistic features of Chinese to be taught at each level. The survey included a number of questions seeking to determine the agreement among high school teachers about which aspects of the language to teach and when to teach them. We chose ten very specific linguistic features that capture the special linguistic features of Mandarin described above and that teachers indicated were essential for a student to master if he or she is to be said to "know" Chinese. Some of these linguistic features might be expected to be introduced at the early level, some at the middle level, and some at the higher level. Clearly, these are not the only ten patterns that might have been chosen, but they are fairly typical. Moreover, they represent features that one would need to know in order to be able to communicate at a fairly simple level—aspect markers, expression of time, comparisons, questions, and so on.

Many teachers had difficulty stating definitively exactly when a student would be expected to master a particular feature. Indeed, while most teachers were able to indicate when they felt their students had mastered a particular pattern, others indicated the level at which they introduced each pattern as well as when they felt their students would have mastered it. One teacher broke the patterns down as to how much of the pattern had been mastered, or how often it was faced. Finally, one teacher reminded us, "Most of these [patterns] are taught during the first year, but reviewed in the second and third years. Some students *never* master them." With this caveat, Table 4.6 lists ten different structural patterns of Chinese and indicates at which level different percentages of teachers feel that their students should have gained some mastery of them.

Table 4.6: Percentage of Teachers Expecting Specific Structural Patterns to Be Mastered at Various Levels

Structural Pattern	**Level 1**	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
Clause + *de* + noun	60.8	32.6	4.4	2.2
Sentence *le*	57.5	29.8	10.6	2.1
Shi . . . *de* pattern	34.9	41.9	18.6	4.6
Question words as indefinites	30.4	32.6	23.8	13.0
Expression of time spent	27.8	58.1	11.6	2.3
Aspect markers (*le, guo, zhe*)	23.8	40.6	31.0	4.8
Verb + *de* + manner or degree	21.3	59.6	17.0	2.1
Bã pattern	20.0	51.1	22.2	6.7
Resultative verbs (*mãi-bu-qi*)	18.6	46.5	30.2	4.7
Comparison pattern (*bǐ*)	16.3	60.4	16.3	7.0

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The first thing to be noted is that there is general agreement that most of these features should be mastered by students during the first two years of instruction. Second, there is some rough consensus about the proper sequence for teaching the various features, indicated by the order of presentation in the table. However, that general order includes a substantial amount of disagreement as to the level at which a feature is to be mastered. This disagreement is the result not of a difference of opinion between native and non-native-speaker teachers (their judgments were identical) but of more general preferential differences among teachers. In short, as in the case of the teaching of characters and the use of transliteration systems, consensus has yet to be reached concerning which linguistic features of the language are to be taught and when.

The need to develop some agreement among high school teachers as to what linguistic patterns students should be expected to learn is recognized in the field. In developing a set of general curricular guidelines for high school Chinese, the CLASS committee listed thirty-four patterns it felt students should master, but it clearly stated that "this is not a linguistically rigorous list of grammatical patterns. It is . . . a listing of the patterns and grammatical points which we believe a student should master to perform successfully at our definition of level two [proficiency]."[10] It will be interesting to see whether Chinese language teachers more generally will adopt the CLASS committee's recommended set of linguistic features to be mastered by proficiency-level 2 students. But even this attempt to move toward a consensus on which structural features to teach said nothing about the order in which these features should be presented. There is clearly much yet to do.

---

[10] CLASS, "Guidelines for Chinese Language Teaching in Secondary Schools."

Teaching Culture

Most teachers have long recognized that it is unproductive to teach students just the mechanics of a foreign language. Language use and meaning are so firmly embedded in a culture that instruction on purely linguistic features does not serve the learner well. Indeed, there is in progress a lively debate about whether the principal goal of foreign language teaching should be to provide not usable language skills but rather insight into a culture other than one's own. In any event, the immersion of language instruction in a cultural context is a matter of increasing concern for foreign language teachers.

The need to incorporate cultural background into language instruction is felt especially strongly by teachers of languages where the culture, like the language itself, is "truly foreign"—that is, where there are as few cultural cognates as there are linguistic cognates between the language to be learned and one's own.[11] Indeed, the very function of a "truly foreign" language itself is so different that it is impossible to give students any sense of meaning and usage without explaining something about the very different cultural context.

The challenge for the high school teacher is to cram cultural learning into the same very limited time available for teaching language skills per se. High school Chinese teachers are well aware of both the need for cultural instruction and, in the case of a society as different from our own as China's, the immense scale of such an enterprise. The CLASS committee's proposal for curricular guidelines comments as follows: "Part of the responsibility of language teachers in the secondary school is to introduce some aspects of the target language culture. Therefore, we have included a list of culture topics teachers may wish to weave into their language classes. We expect that students at [proficiency] level two will have at least an understanding of these topics."[12] The listed topics—there are twenty-eight of them—include such linguistically entwined aspects as names, the development of the writing system, calligraphy, exclamations, proverbs, and body language. The guidelines go on to mention the cultural significance of specific colors, the calendar, signs of the zodiac, etiquette, folklore, philosophy and religion, and sports, then on to history, geography, education, politics, high culture, and holidays. The point of this elaboration is to suggest how vast a topic culture is when the focus is the Chinese language, and how much of it is incorporated into the language. For instance, in China one sign of a well-educated person is the ability to interject arcane but appropriate proverbs into conversation.

Culture in the Language Classroom

How do teachers respond to the challenge of providing cultural context? The questionnaire part of the survey attempted to answer this question in two ways. First, teachers were asked how much classroom time they spent on providing specifically cultural information.

---

[11] Eleanor H. Jorden and A. Ronald Walton, "Truly Foreign Languages: Instructional Challenges," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 490 (March 1987): 110–24.

[12] CLASS, "Guidelines for Chinese Language Teaching in Secondary Schools."

While this topic is vast and important, we touched on it only lightly in the survey, because it is so difficult to separate out the culture from the language portion. Teachers were asked how they presented cultural materials on China and how frequently they did so. Second, they were asked how they went about interweaving cultural background with their language teaching. Table 4.7 indicates for each level of instruction the proportion of class time devoted to instruction about Chinese culture.

Table 4.7: Percentage of Classroom Time Devoted to Cultural Instruction

Course	Percent
Exploring Chinese	22
Level 1	11
Level 2	9
Level 3	10
Level 4/5	10
Pre-International Baccalaureate	15

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

As might be expected, the preparatory course Exploring Chinese devotes the highest percentage of time to Chinese culture, and the Pre–International Baccalaureate course, with its emphasis on substantive as well as linguistic knowledge, is slightly above the average. In the regular Chinese language courses at all levels only about 10 percent of the time is spent on imparting cultural knowledge. In one sense, of course, just learning the language provides insight into Chinese culture, but the evidence is strong that the demands of teaching the basic language skills make cultural instruction at best marginal.

How do the teachers go about providing students with the cultural context? Table 4.8 shows the teachers' ratings of the relative frequency with which they use various methods of providing instruction on Chinese culture.

Table 4.8: Frequency with Which Teachers Use Various Methods of Providing Cultural Instruction (percent)

Method	A Lot	Some	Rarely	Never
Incorporate cultural information into language materials	57.4	38.3	4.3	0.0
Discuss cultural information	47.8	47.8	4.4	0.0
Use films, videos, guests	21.7	67.4	10.9	0.0
Plan extracurricular activities	8.5	53.2	36.2	2.1
Provide a formal component on culture	8.7	52.2	34.8	4.3
Give lectures on China	8.9	42.2	42.2	6.7

Note: Categories were defined as follows—"a lot," once a week; "some," once a month; "rarely," once or twice a year.

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

As the table shows, the method teachers most commonly use to teach the culture of China is to incorporate the information into their language materials, followed by discussions about cultural information. Teachers use films or videos with some regularity, as well as planning extracurricular activities and providing formal components on culture. Pure lectures on China are used least frequently. In view of the debate in the field of language instruction about the role of understanding cultural background, it would be interesting to know whether the amount of cultural training given in these high schools makes any difference, whether it is enough, and whether the various techniques used to impart it are effective.

Information on the provision of cultural context was derived not only from questionnaire responses but from site visits. On those site visits it was obvious that most teachers were enthusiastic about teaching Chinese culture. In almost all the twenty-five schools that were visited, Chinese New Year's called for a big celebration—preferably at a Chinese restaurant. In one classroom students were busy learning the proper use of chopsticks; without certification in chopstick technology, they were considered unqualified to participate in the festivities. While one often hears the term *chopsticks Chinese* used to disparage an inferior course in Chinese, this course demonstrated how such simple cultural exposure could be used in language learning. Students were learning to count and were learning the names of the bowls and dishes used on the table, as well as what would be served in them, in what order, and why. Simultaneously, they were being corrected and coached on their proficiency in chopsticks control—in Chinese. In several classrooms students were making papier-mâché dragons to be used in a dragon dance at a New Year's program, and learning something about the different ways in which the New Year is celebrated. Another teacher had students make presents to be passed out on New Year's Day to every school member, student or faculty, who remembered to wear the correct color that day. Another teacher had the students develop an assembly program for the entire school that incorporated dances, songs, and a fashion show of traditional costumes from various parts of China. While the language of the assembly was English, the students learned a great deal about China as they worked to develop a show that other students would find interesting. Another class transformed a traditional Chinese story, "The Nightingale," into a play for younger students.

All these various activities are mentioned to give a sense of the vitality and enthusiasm with which cultural materials are brought into the classroom. The cultural component that most teachers introduce is so rich, and so enriching to the students, that it is difficult to think of culture in terms of "How often do you do this?" Interviews with students indicated that they enjoy the cultural aspect of learning Chinese and the dramatic, very concrete exploration of how different Chinese culture is from their own.

Supplemental Courses on China

At the college level Chinese culture is very often taught in substantive courses rather than in courses devoted to language. To what extent is this supplemental training available in the high schools in the survey sample? To a surprising extent, such training is available. Most of the schools (60 percent) offer other full courses that are related to China. In addition, 87 percent of the teachers say that their schools offer courses that have significant segments dealing with China—less than a full course's worth, but some focus. Among the courses reported are philosophy and religion, art and music, world history, global studies, and Chinese history. The courses covering Chinese materials that were most frequently mentioned by the teachers are civilization (eleven times) and Asian history (nine times).

Not only are these substantive courses reported as being available for students to take; teachers report that a substantial portion of their students do in fact take one or another of them. Only 12 percent say that less than one-tenth of their students take such a course; 23 percent say that one-quarter of them do so; 19 percent say that between one-quarter and one-half do so; and fully 46 percent say that more than one-half of their students take a nonlanguage course dealing with China.

Travel to China

The ultimate in bringing cultural context to language learning, and in improving language skills more generally, is a trip to the country where the language is spoken. Such trips add a degree of reality and immediacy to the study of Chinese that is difficult for even the best classroom to provide. For the Western European languages, individual teachers, schools, and educational travel organizations offer a wide variety of opportunities for students to travel abroad. Many provide an opportunity to study in a foreign school or to live in a family setting where language skills can be enhanced and used effectively.

With Chinese, however, the opportunities for travel abroad are fewer, harder to generate, and more difficult to sustain. This is particularly true when the goal is to travel to the People's Republic of China. The cost per student is much higher, making it more difficult for individual students to find the funds necessary for participation. Contacts with the People's Republic of China, and even Taiwan, are fewer and more distant. There are fewer intermediary agencies available to work with high schools and spare them the burden of making arrangements directly. The personal contact between the organizer of the trip and the individuals responsible for local arrangements is particularly important in assuring that the trip will be successful. For the student, living conditions may be difficult and culture shock extreme. In short, arranging a successful program to provide high school students with the experience of traveling and living in China[13] is a very difficult enterprise.

Yet in spite of these problems, just under three-quarters of the teachers report that some of their students have traveled to China, and slightly over half report that there are regular opportunities for students to do so. A major limitation to the expansion of such trips is their high cost. Over 80 percent of the schools that had sent students to China reported that it was the parents who paid for the trip—and that a trip could cost well over $1,000 per student. About half of the schools regularly sending students abroad had dealt with an outside organization—generally one with an academic orientation—while the rest had organized the trip internally. Generally, school-arranged trips to China were limited to students in the Chinese language program, although three schools did permit other students to join in. Such trips therefore served the double purpose of providing both a real-life cultural context for language learning and an incentive for students to enroll in and stay with the language courses.

---

[13] In this instance "China" is used to refer to any of the Chinese-speaking areas of Asia—the People's Republic of China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore.

While benefits for language learning are one obvious result of student travel to China, it is surprising that when teachers were asked what they wanted their students to gain from a trip to China, the lowest objective on their list was a sharpening of language skills. From their perspective the students were sufficiently drilled and grilled on the language during the academic year; the purpose of the trip went beyond language skills. It was cultural broadening that the teachers sought for their students, a feel for the country and a sense of the people. This the students would get from participating in the obligatory banquets held by and for their hosts; learning how to move around the country and the city by bus and by train; seeing the sights, from the Great Wall to vegetable markets; listening and observing. The teachers hoped that their students would come back fascinated with China and committed to learning the Chinese language.

Summary

The most striking feature of high school instruction in Chinese is its variety. Unlike instruction in the commonly taught languages, the content of instruction for a course in Chinese is not well defined. Issues that were resolved decades if not centuries ago for romance languages, with regard to what to teach when, are still burning issues in Chinese language instruction. The problem stems in large part from the fact that Chinese is not a cognate language with English, and so issues arise that have never had to be faced in the romance language classroom. Questions on how best to teach a tonal language; how to teach a totally alien writing system that is not alphabetic but character-based; how to choose an appropriate transcription system—all these must be addressed. Additionally, teachers must decide whether to emphasize the spoken language or the written language. These decisions are made differently by individual teachers, and the variations seem to be random. For instance, there does not appear to be a systematic difference between native Chinese and native English speakers.

The data indicate that Chinese language instruction at the high school level is often embedded in a surprisingly rich supporting frame of courses on China, noncurricular activities concerning China, and visits to the country. While the enhancement of this network was not one of the stated goals of the Dodge program, it is reassuring to discover how extensive these supporting activities are.

The next chapter takes a closer look at the classroom with regard to practices and resources.

Chapter Five

Teaching Practices and Resources

The previous chapter was concerned with what is taught in high school Chinese classrooms. This chapter will examine the various classroom activities and the resources the teacher can use to carry them out. It will be concerned with the distribution of activities within the classroom, teacher and student workloads, testing, teaching materials, and other equipment supporting language instruction.

Classroom Activities

There is a growing consensus among foreign language teachers about the most effective use of classroom time: in the ideal classroom, the less time spent lecturing in English about the target language, the better. How close to this ideal do teachers of high school Chinese come? The teachers surveyed indicated that they spend approximately 25 percent of their time talking in English about Chinese. In addition, in the ideal classroom most of the time should be spent on activities that require interaction in the language, either among students or between students and the teacher. The Chinese teachers reported that 57 percent of classroom time is spent on such activities; the remaining 18 percent of the time is devoted to movies, cultural activities, or activities such as Chinese calligraphy. One question that has not yet been faced by high school Chinese language teachers—the survey found no debate on this issue, in the course of either site visits or individual interviews with teachers—is whether this mix of activities is appropriate for the teaching of Chinese.

In addition to concentrating classroom time on interaction rather than on receptive or passive skills, another, more general, principle of modern foreign language pedagogy is that use of the target language should take up an overwhelming proportion of classroom time. Hence, in addition to questions about types of classroom activities, the teachers were asked to estimate for each level of instruction the amount of time they spent using Chinese, as opposed to English, as the medium of instruction. Table 5.1 presents the results.

Table 5.1: Percentage of Classroom Time Spent Utilizing Chinese as the Medium of Instruction

	Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4/5**
All teachers	50	65	75	80
Native Chinese speakers	53	67	76	82
Native English speakers	44	57	69	76

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

As might be expected, the teachers report a heavier use of English at the early levels, but the use of Chinese increases as the level of instruction advances. This is true whether the teacher is a native Chinese or native English speaker. It should also be noted that native English speakers consistently use less Chinese at every level; however, the difference is not overwhelming, and it narrows as the instructional level advances. A T-test revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between native Chinese and native English speakers in the use of Chinese as the medium of instruction at any level of instruction.

It is difficult to judge how effective this mix of activities and languages is. Simply carrying over the goals of teachers of the Western European languages—maximizing interactive skills and using the target language as the medium of instruction—may be inappropriate for such a decidedly difficult and different language as Chinese. These goals have been developed and tested for European languages, mainly French, German, and Spanish—languages that differ enormously from Chinese. The student of Chinese has few or no cognates to guide the learning process; the written form of the language is character-based rather than alphabetic; the pronunciation system differs radically from those of the commonly taught languages; there are new and complex grammatical concepts; and the culture in which the language is embedded is very different from either American or European culture. Given these radical differences from the languages for which high school instructional models were developed, it is remarkable how much time teachers of high school Chinese report working interactively and in the target language, even at the initial levels of instruction. However, the question of the most effective mix of activities and language use requires separate consideration by the teachers of Chinese themselves as part of their more general effort to reach consensus on a curriculum.

Homework Assignments

Educational practice, of course, involves not only what takes place in the classroom but also what the student learns from homework assignments. The teachers were asked a series of questions about what topics they assign and how much time they expect students to spend studying Chinese outside of class. Table 5.2 indicates the proportion of teachers who reported assigning a particular topic as part of homework. Table 5.3 indicates the average number of minutes per week students are expected to spend on each topic. Once again, the data are presented separately for native English and Chinese speakers. Together they give another indication of the pedagogical emphases of these teachers.

Table 5.2: Percentage of Teachers Assigning Various Homework Activities

Activity	Chinese Speakers	English Speakers	All Teachers
Learning characters/writing	91.4	92.3	91.7
Memorizing vocabulary	85.7	92.3	87.5
Written exercises	82.9	92.3	85.4
Studying grammar	62.9	53.8	60.4
Memorizing dialogues	57.1	61.5	58.3
Working with tapes	60.0	46.2	56.3
Nonlanguage cultural assignments	34.3	38.5	35.4

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

Table 5.3: Mean Number of Minutes Teachers Expect Students to Spend per Week on Various Homework Activities

Activity	Chinese Speakers	English Speakers	All Teachers
Learning characters/writing	91.7	105.8	95.9
Memorizing vocabulary	76.3	81.3	77.8
Written exercises	73.4	73.3	73.4
Studying grammar	70.0	62.9	68.1
Working with tapes	53.9	70.0	57.3
Memorizing dialogues	43.8	37.5	41.7
Nonlanguage cultural assignments	32.3	21.4	28.9
Total	441.4	452.2	443.1

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

These tables reflect a pattern of pedagogical practice similar to that indicated in the previous chapter: (1) a heavy emphasis on writing skills, as evidenced by the learning of characters and the use of written exercises; (2) an emphasis on vocabulary memorization, where demands are overwhelming not only because of the total lack of cognates but because memorization includes the ability both to recognize an item orally and aurally and to read and write it (although the Chinese pronunciation system is complex, aural recognition and oral production alone should not consume this much time); and (3) an emphasis on grammar, which is often checked by writing in Chinese characters—again, a double load. The mastery of oral skills and cultural materials have a much smaller role in homework assignments, as they did in the teachers' overall emphases. Oral homework requires cassette recorders and tapes, which, according to the teachers, students do not like to use. The amount of time spent on memorizing vocabulary suggests that teachers are including character recognition and writing in this type of homework. Indeed, judging from the homework assignments, pedagogical practice in the teaching of Chinese looks very traditional.

Do homework assignments show the same variation from teacher to teacher that we have seen for other aspects of teaching content and practice? Native Chinese-speaking teachers differ relatively little from native English speakers in the manner in which they assign homework. In no homework area is there a statistically significant difference between the two groups. Small differences appear in the Chinese speakers' greater emphasis on grammar and (surprisingly) working with tapes, and in the English speakers' tendency to use dialogue memorization.

While there are, on average, only small differences in homework emphasis between native English and native Chinese speakers, the range among teachers more generally is very substantial. There is as little consensus on homework assignments as there is on other aspects of the curriculum. Indeed, the dispersion is so high that standard deviations around each mean are almost as large as the mean itself. For instance, for the amount of time assigned to memorizing vocabulary, the mean was 78 minutes and the standard deviation was 50 minutes. The minimal estimate was 20 minutes and the maximum 240 minutes. Nor do these variations appear to be by-products of differences in course level. Rather, they reflect basic differences in pedagogical practice. Homework assignments are another candidate for the development of curricular consensus among teachers.

Teacher Workload

One of the issues that is constantly discussed at meetings among high school Chinese language teachers is their workload, which they perceive to be extra heavy. They regard other foreign language teachers as having an abundance of resources available for use in developing interesting curricula or lesson plans. If one approach does not work with a particular class, the teacher can easily switch to a different one; if the teacher wants to drill the class on a particular aspect of the language, he or she can just flip through an off-the-shelf "drill book" and choose an appropriate exercise from a wide range of possibilities. The Chinese teachers, on the other hand, perceive themselves as having to work with textbooks that are only minimally appropriate for their purposes. Furthermore, they themselves have to create any supplemental teaching materials or drills needed in the course. Nor are there specialized materials available to teach specific skills. For instance, few off-the-shelf materials are available for teaching the difficult writing system, and teachers must fall back on teaching students in the same way they themselves were taught—which may or may not be the best approach. Methods of teaching the tonal pronunciation system are not well spelled out either. And even those teaching materials that do exist are almost entirely targeted to college students. Tailoring (or preparing from scratch) teaching materials to suit the particular learning and motivational styles of high school students is a major challenge.

One of the concerns most often expressed in interviews was that the teachers need to find new ways to teach specific linguistic features. They simply have no free time to rethink and redesign curricula or weekly lesson plans; they have few options but to repeat what they did the previous year, whether or not they or their students liked it. In most cases (90.7 percent) the teacher is the only teacher of Chinese at the school; he or she must personally design and teach a curriculum for up to four levels of Chinese, without any colleagues to share the workload. The sense of pressure is so overwhelming that even when teachers bring back new supplementary materials from workshops—as they did from the workshop held at Northfield Mount Hermon in 1989—the immediate classroom demands are such that they have no time to integrate these materials into their lesson plans.[1]

This feeling of overload on the part of the Chinese teachers is one of the most consistent findings of the survey. Yet the colleagues with whom they are comparing themselves—the teachers of the commonly taught languages—tend to think that the teachers of Chinese have an easy life. They have only ten or fifteen students in their classes on average, not the thirty or thirty-five found in the commonly-taught-language classrooms; they can therefore afford to spend time with individual students. Besides, their students are not enrolled just to fill a requirement—they tend to be motivated language learners. On the downside, the teachers of the Western European languages regard the curricula and lesson plans developed by the Chinese teachers as somewhat amateurish and perhaps not "serious" compared with the goals of their own classrooms.

These contrasting sets of perceptions tend to increase the Chinese language teachers' isolation from their colleagues teaching other languages. But as always, it must be emphasized that the Chinese teachers reported that on the whole the other language teachers have been of enormous help to them in developing their own teaching skills. This Jekyll/Hyde paradox is always present when comparing the Chinese language teachers with their colleagues in the Western European languages.

To obtain some specifics about this feeling of absolute and comparative overload, both principals and teachers were asked about the number of class hours and the different courses assigned to the teachers. In addition, teachers were asked for their perceptions about the preparations made by other foreign language teachers and the number of hours they themselves spent each week on their various professional responsibilities.

The average class period was 47 minutes long and varied from a low of 40 minutes to a high of 55 minutes, usually (in 83.7 percent of the schools) for five days a week. Teachers of Chinese averaged 3.8 classes daily for which they needed to make separate preparations. The most common number of separate preparations per day—cited by 54.3 percent of the teachers—was either four or five. However, not all these preparations were necessarily for Chinese language instruction, since many of the teachers taught other subjects as well. But they reported that even with shortcuts and strategies developed over the years, preparations for each Chinese class could take an hour or so each day, and this before they even started to look at student homework. When asked to compare the number of daily preparations they had to make with the number made by other foreign language teachers, 20 percent of the teachers felt that they had no basis for comparison. Omitting those teachers from the comparison, almost two-thirds (64.9 percent) felt that they had to make more preparations than other foreign language teachers. Slightly over one-fourth (27.0 percent) felt that they had the same number of preparations to make, and a little under one-tenth (8.1 percent) felt that they had fewer.

---

[1] At the Northfield Mount Hermon workshop, teachers enthusiastically shared materials that they had individually devised, and demonstrated how they had effectively used them in their own classrooms. At the site visits, one of the stock questions teachers were asked was "Are you using any of the materials shared with you by other teachers at the workshop?" The invariable answer was that they would like to but were just too busy getting through the day, the week, or the term to incorporate them into their teaching.

To round out the picture of the teachers' workload, we tried to get some sense of their total professional load by asking them how much time they spent each week on their various responsibilities. Table 5.4 presents the results. The amount of time spent in the classroom was computed using the mean number of minutes in a class period and the average number of preparations per day. The other information is derived from direct teacher responses.

Table 5.4: Average Number of Hours Teachers Spend per Week on Various Responsibilities

Activity	Chinese Speakers	English Speakers	All Teachers
Chaperoning student activities	2.8	2.2	2.6
Working on school committees	1.0	1.6	1.2
Working with individual students	4.1	5.4	4.5
Working with parents	0.7	0.7	0.7
Grading student performances	8.4	7.5	8.1
Making class preparations	11.8	11.0	11.6
Professional development	4.5	4.5	4.5
In the classroom	14.5	16.5	15.0
Total	47.8	49.4	48.2

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The data in the table are presented separately for native English and native Chinese speakers. Again, there is very little difference between the work schedules of the two groups. The small differences that do appear are well within the range of sampling variability. The final column combines the two groups, and the final row presents an estimate of the total amount of time teachers spend each week on all the various activities combined. Classroom time, preparation time, working with individual students, and grading add up to about thirty-nine hours per week, about the same as the workweek of others in the labor force. However, all the other activities—committee work, meeting with parents, professional development, and so on—add an additional eight hours to the workload, giving Chinese high school teachers the equivalent of a six-day workweek.

The workload is indeed heavy in absolute terms, and as noted earlier, most of these teachers feel that it exceeds the demands placed on other foreign language teachers. Unfortunately, we do not have any data on the amount of time teachers of the commonly taught languages devote to each of these professional responsibilities. Without that information we cannot say with any certainty that Chinese high school language teachers in fact have a heavier workload than other foreign language teachers. It is also clear that until better materials and resources are developed and made available, this sense of overwork will continue, especially in the current economic climate. The obvious solution—decreasing classroom time in order to compensate for the extra burden of materials preparation—is one that few schools can afford to implement in the face of externally mandated workloads and the danger of showing partiality among teachers. The other solution—increasing the number of teachers per school—is equally unlikely until these programs grow considerably bigger.

Evaluation

How well do students of Chinese do in their studies? It is difficult to answer this question in the absence of clear and impartial measures of student competencies achieved through the courses. Chinese language instruction at the high school level has not followed the national movement toward utilizing standardized tests that are independent of a particular teacher or classroom and toward measuring oral proficiency in a one-on-one interactive format. While not many high schools have undertaken professional proficiency testing of their French, German, and Spanish students, College Board achievement and advanced placement tests are available. A recurring comment on the questionnaires returned to us by principals (both Dodge and non-Dodge), teachers, high school students, and high school alumni is that there is a need for standardized tests by which Chinese language students can be judged.

In language instruction generally there has been a major swing toward using a testing strategy developed in the Foreign Service and the Intelligence Community. Variably referred to as proficiency testing or the Oral Proficiency Interview, this strategy uses a structured interview to rate real-life language performance. It is used extensively in government Chinese language teaching establishments and to a lesser extent on college campuses. In addition, there is now available for Chinese a nationally standardized paper-and-pencil test developed at the Center for Applied Linguistics to test reading and listening skills. Unfortunately, this nationally normed test is most appropriate for college-level students, although an attempt was recently made to fill in a high school–level stratum.

At the moment, testing in Chinese at the high school level tends to be confined to old-fashioned achievement tests reflecting the idiosyncratic teaching practices of individual teachers—which, as we have seen, are quite varied. Eighty-five percent of the teachers surveyed indicated that they conduct oral tests, but few of them follow the common protocol and rating scheme that have become popular in the language education field for other languages and other levels.

Fortunately, a major effort is under way to develop both a College Board achievement test in Chinese and a set of curricular guidelines arrived at by consensus. Progress on these tasks should be made within the next few years. Few developments could enhance the quality of Chinese high school instruction more. This was not part of the Dodge Chinese Initiative, but without that initiative the move to develop a standardized test and core curriculum would not have happened so quickly. There has not yet been any visible movement in the field toward the use of standardized tests, either for certification of student performance or to provide feedback to assist in program development, but this should change as a core curriculum and standardized test designed specifically for high school students are created.

Even without standardized tests, teachers assign grades at the end of each course level. To get some idea of how this ad hoc rating system actually operates, teachers were asked what percentage of students received grades of A, B, and so on. It is clear from interviews with both teachers and students that Chinese learners are generally thought to be very grade-driven and unlikely to take a course unless it is a "gut." There was also the expectation that since their jobs depend on having students to fill their classes, teachers would give out inflated grades. A priori, it appeared likely that grade inflation and low standards would reign. The survey's expectation was that the average course grade would hover around an A minus.

This expectation, however, was not borne out. However much they feared the effect of low grades on enrollments, teachers showed great integrity in grading. According to the teachers, the average grade of students taking Chinese was 3.12—a very solid B. (By way of comparison, the students as a group thought they did better, reporting a 3.45 average in Chinese.) To say that the average grade given by teachers was 3.12 does not mean that grade inflation and low standards did not sometimes prevail; one teacher reported giving a grade of A to 90 percent of the students. On the other hand, one-fourth of the teachers reported giving at least some students a failing grade.

Some of the data collected from the students provide an even richer view of both evaluation and accomplishment. Students were asked to report their general grade point average (GPA) for the last reporting period, the grade they received in Chinese for the same period, and the grades they remembered receiving for other foreign language courses. While there is a possibility that they reported higher grades than they actually received, previous studies of reported versus actual grades suggest that while the bias is upwards, the grades reported are reasonably close to those actually received.

With this in mind, the data indicated that students taking Chinese report an average GPA higher than that of the general high school population in the United States. The overall GPA of American high school students, as reported in *High School and Beyond*, is 2.90, while students taking Chinese report an average GPA of 3.37—a solid B plus.[2] If a student is in a public school, a girl, or ethnically Chinese, the average grade is slightly higher, but still in that B-plus range.

Do students do better in Chinese than in their other courses? The students reported an average grade in Chinese of 3.45—inching toward A minus. Thus, they do report getting a better grade in Chinese than in their other courses. One explanation for this is grade inflation in Chinese, a subject discounted above from the perspective of the teachers.

Further evidence on this point may be derived from a comparison with the grades students received in other languages. Students were not only asked to report their grades in Chinese and their other courses in general; those who had taken courses in French, German, or Spanish were also asked to report their grades in those courses. On the average, they remembered getting significantly higher grades in these commonly taught languages than in Chinese. While there may be grade inflation in language courses, it seems to be less prevalent in Chinese.

The evidence on the higher average grades in the commonly taught languages and in Chinese, as well as the teachers' reports on the grade spread among students, casts doubt on the opinion widely held among other foreign language teachers that Chinese is a "gut" course. Other faculty members may believe that students are taking Chinese to raise their GPAs for college admission, and in some cases this may be true; but the data indicate that if raising the GPA is the student's primary purpose, he or she should stick with one of the commonly taught languages.

---

[2] William B. Fetters and Jeffrey A. Owings, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *High School and Beyond* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984).

There is another possible explanation for students showing higher grades in Chinese than in other courses: these students are generally good language learners. To provide some evidence on this question, students' reported grades in Chinese were correlated with their reported grades in other languages. That correlation was not significant; a student's grade in another language was not necessarily a good predictor of the grade he or she would get in Chinese. Clearly, studying Chinese has its own special challenges over and above those presented by studying foreign languages in general, and different students do better or worse at it regardless of their past language learning experience.

Textbooks

To get a further idea of the degree of consensus on classroom strategies, teachers were asked about the textbooks they used and the number of chapters or units they expected to cover at each course level. The seven most commonly used textbooks were listed as choices, and a few others were mentioned by teachers as free responses. Only *The Chinese Primer* and *Step by Step* were developed with high school students primarily in mind. The other texts were developed for college students and are, or have been, widely used on college campuses. Table 5.5 indicates which textbooks were used and at which levels.

Table 5.5: Number of Teachers Using Particular Textbooks, by Level

Textbook	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5
Chinese Primer (T. T. Ch'en)	26	27	15	5
Beginning Chinese (DeFrancis)	4	5	3	1
New Chinese 300 (Beijing)	5	5	2	1
Practical Chinese Reader	7	6	5	3
Elementary Chinese Reader	2	4	6	4
Lady in the Painting	0	2	2	2
DeFrancis story booklets	0	0	3	2
Other				
Step by Step	4	2	1	0
Read Chinese	1	1	1	1
Other materials	9	8	9	8

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The most obvious conclusion is that most of the teachers used T. T. Ch'en's *Chinese Primer*, but usually in combination with other textbooks. Teachers tended not to rely on a single textbook but rather used multiple sources of material. A second conclusion is that as students progressed to more advanced levels, the use of any published textbook—including *The Chinese Primer*—declined. This pattern is characteristic of much foreign language instruction, particularly in the less commonly taught languages: most of the published teaching materials focus on the lower skill levels. The modest curricular consensus introduced by textbooks is even less evident at the advanced levels and may vary from one year to the next.

There was very little difference in the pattern of use of these various texts by native Chinese versus English speakers and by public versus private school teachers. However, some texts were used exclusively by native or English speakers or by public or private schools, at some levels. For instance, at level 4/5 the DeFrancis story booklets were used only by native speakers in private schools, and at level 2 *Lady in the Painting* was used only by native English speakers in private schools. More generally, however, the choice of texts was a matter of personal preference.

Both questionnaire results and interviews indicate that teachers of high school Chinese feel that the textbooks commercially available are inadequate for students at their level. They desperately need a good textbook for high school students. To meet this need and to encourage more uniformity in the text materials used in the classroom, the Dodge Foundation put 7.4 percent of its total Chinese Initiative investment into the development of a textbook specifically geared to high school Chinese. Other than the investment in teacher workshops and the overall funding of individual programs, the textbook project was the largest recipient of Dodge funds.

The textbook sponsored by the Dodge Foundation was T. T. Ch'en's *Chinese Primer*, and as is evident from Table 5.5, it was the single textbook most commonly used by teachers in 1989. Since a major portion of the Dodge Chinese Initiative funds was spent on developing this textbook, it is important to probe teacher attitudes toward it. It is also important to note that this text was prepared for high school use not by teachers with experience in high school education, but by an expert at the university level—T. T. Ch'en, who was a professor at Princeton University when the textbook was developed. One of the dilemmas in teaching the less commonly taught languages in high schools at the early stage of field development is that the expertise, resources, and time necessary for constructing text materials tend to be concentrated at the university level, while the future audience is at the high school level. Hence, the assessment of the text by practicing teachers at that level provides some insight into the suitability of this strategy for future interventions.

Sixty-three percent of the teachers who returned questionnaires used *The Chinese Primer*. Slightly over half of them also used the audiotapes and videotapes designed to accompany the textbook. The teachers were asked how they used these materials in the classroom. Table 5.6 gives their responses.

Table 5.6: Percentage of Teachers Using Dodge Materials in the Classroom

Use of Material	Percent
Have seen but do not use	25.0
Use Dodge materials as supplementary, not core	27.1
Use Dodge materials as core; supplement with other material	43.8
Use Dodge materials exclusively	4.1

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

A few teachers evaluated the items for each level of Chinese they taught and indicated that their selection of materials depended somewhat on the level of Chinese they were teaching. Some teachers used non-Dodge materials for the core of first-year Chinese and then switched to Dodge materials for the second year; one teacher used Dodge materials as the core in the first year, then used other materials as the core in the third and fourth. All the teachers were aware that Dodge had supported the development of instructional materials for high school Chinese.

In addition to how much they used the Dodge materials, we also asked the teachers how well they liked them. In conversations and in questionnaires they were asked to evaluate *The Chinese Primer*. Table 5.7 illustrates the level of satisfaction of the teachers who used *The Chinese Primer* and the accompanying audiotapes and videotapes.

Table 5.7: Teachers' Satisfaction with *The Chinese Primer* Materials

	Percent of Teachers				
Material	Totally Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Totally Satisfied	Number of Responses
Textbook	3.6	21.4	67.9	7.1	28
Audiotapes	8.7	43.5	43.5	4.3	23
Videotapes	8.3	20.8	54.2	16.7	24

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

Most of the teachers who actually used the Dodge materials were satisfied with the textbook (75 percent) and with the videotapes (71 percent); fewer were satisfied with the audiotapes (48 percent). Slightly over two-thirds of those who used the textbook used the video- and audiotapes as well.

In addition to rating their general satisfaction with *The Chinese Primer*, the teachers were asked to evaluate its adequacy with regard to various qualities. Table 5.8 presents the results. The percentages are based on the number of teachers responding to each item.

Table 5.8: Adequacy of Various Aspects of *The Chinese Primer* as Perceived by Teachers Using It

Feature	**Percent of Teachers**				**Number of Responses**
	Very Adequate	**Adequate**	**Inadequate**	**Very Inadequate**	
Authentic Chinese usage	61.5	30.8	7.7	0.0	26
Reflection of PRC usage	26.9	42.4	26.9	3.8	26
Reflection of Taiwan usage	9.5	47.6	28.6	14.3	21
Lesson design	3.8	46.2	42.3	7.7	26
Ease of use by teacher	7.4	29.6	40.7	22.3	27
Ease of use by learner	3.7	22.2	59.3	14.8	27
Realistic presentation of useful communicative situations	22.2	48.1	25.9	3.7	27
Sensitivity to culture	8.0	48.0	36.0	8.0	25
Vocabulary	33.3	40.7	18.6	7.4	27
Explanation of grammar/word use	30.8	50.0	15.4	3.8	26
Organization of grammatical patterns	26.9	38.5	23.1	11.5	26
Conversational material	25.9	51.9	14.8	7.4	27
Introduction to reading Chinese	14.8	55.6	22.2	7.4	27
Description of the writing system	33.4	48.1	11.1	7.4	27
Instruction on writing characters	40.7	33.4	14.8	11.1	27
Drills and exercises	7.4	25.8	33.4	33.4	27
Romanization system used	46.2	34.6	19.2	0.0	26
Suitability for ages 13 to 17	3.9	34.6	34.6	26.9	26

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

A closer look at the table indicates that while there was general satisfaction with the text, specific aspects were found wanting. The criticisms expressed in both the questionnaires and the interviews centered on the fact that these and similar materials were directed at college-level learners. Chinese high school teachers believe strongly that teaching high school students calls for materials specially tailored to secondary school use, and that the preparation of such materials requires the active participation of those actually teaching at this level. This conviction explains the ambivalence many teachers feel toward *The Chinese Primer*. They generally approve of the text's pedagogical content—explanations of grammar, organization, introduction to reading and writing Chinese, use of authentic material, representations of China (though to a lesser extent Taiwan), conversational material, and so forth. But their approval diminishes when their attention is directed toward classroom use—ease of use for teacher and learner, lesson design, drills, suitability for young learners, and cultural sensitivity. The dual perception may well be due to the fact that the text's authors were experienced Chinese pedagogists and language teachers at the college level, with little experience at lower levels of the instructional system and little knowledge regarding effective means of presenting material to precollegiate students or the variety of material that teachers at that level need to have at their fingertips. As one high school teacher said during a site visit, the first thing she did with *The Chinese Primer* was to break it down into "learning chunks" that her students could absorb.

The fact that such a large percentage of the teachers use the same textbook gives some idea of the degree of consensus on the pace of instruction. Teachers who used the text were asked how many units they expected to complete in a year at each level of instruction. Table 5.9 shows the results. Since there is no significant difference between native and non-native speakers of Chinese or between public and private schools, only the overall distribution of responses is shown.

Table 5.9: Percentage of Teachers Completing Various Numbers of Units in *The Chinese Primer*, by Level

Number of Units	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5
Unspecified	3.8	11.1	12.5	—
One unit	15.4	—	—	—
Two units	53.8	7.4	12.5	25.0
Three units	19.3	11.1	—	—
Four units	7.7	40.7	—	—
Five units	—	7.4	—	—
Six units	—	11.1	31.3	—
Seven units	—	7.4	—	—
Eight units	—	3.8	43.8	75.0
Number of teachers	26	27	16	4

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

Slightly over 50 percent of the teachers cover two units at level 1. There is somewhat less agreement for the other levels, with 40 percent of the teachers finishing the first four units in level 2 and 30 percent going beyond the first four units. At level 3, 40 percent of the teachers cover eight units, but 30 percent cover the first six. At level 4, 75 percent cover eight units, but 25 percent cover only two. Thus, while there is some consensus as to what high school students at each level should complete in *The Chinese Primer*—roughly two units per level—agreement is less than complete. This creates a problem for both the teacher and the student in that there is little sense of accomplishment. While a student in a commonly taught language may say that he or she completes twenty units in a year, the student of Chinese may complete only two. This says nothing about the amount of the language actually learned; it only gives some arbitrary sense of progress. In some ways it is analogous to the Proficiency Guidelines of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, whereby a very accomplished student of a commonly taught language might be rated after four years as proficient at the 1-plus or 2 level, on a scale of 0 to 5; what has been accomplished is not obvious from the numerical level.

The fact that students complete, on the average, only two units of *The Chinese Primer* per year means that teachers must find (or create) supplementary materials in order to keep their students from getting bored. In addition, because the textbook is organized so that each unit includes three to four lessons based on a common theme, vocabulary is very limited and major informational areas—like discussing the weather or asking the way to some destination—are ignored. The teachers must therefore not only present the textbook material in fresh ways but also supplement it with material from other areas their students need to know about.

Other Teaching Resources

Aside from textbooks, what other technical resources—computers, projectors, and so on—are available, and how often do teachers use them? Table 5.10 addresses that question. The columns concerned with frequency of use are limited only to those teachers who have the resource available.

Table 5.10: Percentage of Teachers Reporting Availability and Use of Various Technical Resources

		Frequency of Use		
Resource	**Availability**	**Often**	**Occasional**	**Rare**
VCR/video	83.3	36.1	52.8	11.1
Slide projector	81.3	9.4	53.1	37.5
Take-home audio cassettes	73.8	33.3	40.0	26.7
Movie projector	70.8	0.0	33.3	66.7
Computer	54.2	18.2	9.1	72.7
Language lab for class use	25.0	66.6	16.7	16.7
Language lab for individual use	16.7	57.1	28.6	14.3

Source: Teacher's questionnaire.

The table is ordered by the availability of the different resources, and it is not surprising to find that language laboratories—a very expensive resource to install, maintain, and upgrade—are not commonly available. Slightly over half of the teachers have a computer available, though they do not commonly use it. The other resources appear to be generally available.

In terms of the utilization of available resources, language labs appear to get heavy use from the teachers. Movie projectors, videocassette recorders, and slide projectors are utilized occasionally but do not appear to dominate, and computers are utilized only rarely. This is not surprising, since videotapes and computer programs designed for use in teaching Chinese are in short supply, and most such tapes or programs are oriented more toward college than high school students. The widespread availability of VCRs, however, indicates that many schools and teachers might incorporate them into their instructional design if appropriate high school–oriented materials were available. Slide projectors, though widely available, are not often utilized. This is not surprising, since language instruction is by nature oral. What is surprising is the low utilization of audio cassettes, which students could use with their own cassette recorders. Although a tape duplication and distribution system would be necessary, this would appear to be a very effective and inexpensive way to work with students on comprehension and pronunciation. Our interviews with teachers and students indicated that the low utilization rate of audio cassettes may be attributable to the fact that high school students are not enthusiastic about using them—Madonna, yes; Chinese, no. Teachers have learned to accept the fact that if students are not willing to listen to audiotapes, it makes little sense to force the technology on them. Judging from the frequency with which teachers use the various pieces of equipment available to them, it seems that they are careful consumers of the technology and utilize it only insofar as it contributes to their program—not for its own sake.

Summary

The teaching practices of high school Chinese language teachers are almost as varied as the content of instruction. Teachers differ somewhat in their use of Chinese versus English in the classroom, and even more widely in their emphasis on various aspects of the language, in how much homework they assign and what is covered, in the hours they are expected to teach, and in the availability and use of supplemental teaching resources. The attempt to introduce some consistency via a common textbook has been only partially successful. There is no standardized testing metric that might provide some judgment as to what is most effective. Taken together, these facts certainly permit extreme variation in teaching practice, even if it is not encouraged.

The next chapter will deal with the students enrolled in high school Chinese programs and with the graduates of those programs who have gone on to college.

Chapter Six

Students

So far we have been discussing the teachers and various aspects of the programs and of the instructional process. However, the point of it all is the students. Who are they, why are they studying Chinese, how much instruction do they get, how much time and effort do they invest in the study of Chinese, what do they expect to do with their competency, and how does what they do in high school carry over into college? This chapter addresses these questions.

Most of the information on students comes from two questionnaires. Every student enrolled in a high school Chinese language course in any of the programs covered by the survey (1,783 students in all) filled out a detailed questionnaire. In addition, questionnaires were sent to students who had been enrolled in these programs and had graduated from high school in 1987 or 1988 (476 in all, of whom 211 returned questionnaires). Students were also interviewed during site visits.

Student Characteristics

First, who are the students? Three types of demographic data were collected: type of school attended (public or private), gender, and home language. Information on their experience with other languages was also gathered.

Type of School

The external perception is that Dodge funded only private schools, but that is not the case: two-thirds of the supported programs and the bulk of the students (68.1 percent) are in public schools. It may be recalled that the differences between public and private school programs were relatively slight. Except for the tendency of the private school students to aim for more prestigious colleges and for those colleges to be out of state, there was no significant difference between the two groups in any of the language-relevant characteristics or behavior described below.

Gender

Most enumerations of enrollments in high school foreign language classes show that more girls take foreign languages than boys. For instance, in the national cohort study carried out by the Department of Education, 58.4 percent of the sample of students taking languages were female.[1] Chinese, however, has more boys enrolled than girls: 57.2 percent of the students in the Dodge sample are male. This gender pattern seems to be characteristic of enrollments in the less commonly taught languages at the high school level. The same predominance of males is clear in parallel studies carried out by the National Foreign Language Center: boys accounted for 52.2 percent of the high school students studying Japanese and 54.1 percent of those studying Russian. It is not clear why the gender ratio is reversed among students taking the less commonly taught languages, and Chinese in particular, but it appears to be consistent from school to school and from level to level.

Gender does make a difference in some of the characteristics and language-related behavior of students. Where relevant, these differences will be noted as they occur.

Home Language

From the perspective of the teacher, the most important characteristic of the student is whether he or she comes from a home where Chinese is spoken and, if so, what variety of Chinese it is. How many students bring some knowledge of the language into class and how closely that knowledge approximates what will be taught are important considerations. Moreover, where a number of the students have been exposed to Chinese at home, the situation is much more complex than it would be for an equivalent group where, say, Spanish is spoken at home, because of the substantial differences among Chinese regional dialects. For example, it is not uncommon for children of Cantonese-speaking parents to enroll in high school Chinese. However, high school Chinese usually turns out to be Mandarin. A student from a Cantonese background is therefore studying not a language he or she already knows but rather a foreign (although cognate) one. Or it may be that the Cantonese-speaking student can "read Chinese," but only in Cantonese, not in Mandarin. This is possible because the characters are invariant across the Chinese languages, although the spoken vocabulary varies.

It is equally common for the classroom to include children of Mandarin-speaking parents. Some of these students can speak Chinese, based on its usage at home, but can neither read nor write it. Or they can understand colloquial Chinese as spoken at home but cannot speak it. In many cases this occurs because their parents encourage them to speak English so as to learn it better and do well in school; the parents themselves, however, speak in Chinese because although they understand English, they are not proficient in speaking it and do not want to provide an inaccurate spoken model for their children. Peer pressure from English-speaking schoolmates further encourages the use of spoken English. Thus, students with Mandarin-speaking parents may come to the Chinese classroom with strong comprehension skills but poor production skills. At home such children may speak a mix of Chinese and English—for example, using Chinese syntax with English words or vice versa—and this pattern may carry over into the classroom. Moreover, the Mandarin used around the house is often in informal register; these children would not have been exposed to the more formal register used with native Chinese speakers outside the immediate family. In addition, their vocabulary may not include the more learned lexicon that a Chinese child in China or Taiwan would be acquiring in the formal educational system, particularly through reading.

---

[1] William B. Fetters and Jeffrey A. Owings, U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *High School and Beyond* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984).

A classroom in high school Chinese might look as follows. There are some native English-speaking students with no prior knowledge of either the spoken or the written language. Several students speak a non-Mandarin Chinese language like Cantonese or Taiwanese at home with their parents. While some of these students have had no prior exposure to the written language, others have learned to read and write it from their parents or in a Saturday school. However, when they read aloud, they read in their native Chinese language, not in Mandarin. Thus, while they might be able to do a bit of reading and writing, they do not know the Mandarin pronunciation system. Then there are the students having Mandarin-speaking parents. Some of them can understand spoken Chinese, but they speak it poorly or not at all. Some can speak Mandarin, but it is mixed in complex ways with English. Some can both speak and understand oral Mandarin but cannot read or write it. Some can speak, understand, read, and write but are not familiar with "school" as opposed to "home" vocabulary or with formal as opposed to informal speech.

Actually, this situation is not uncommon in some high school programs. The Chinese teachers therefore confront a challenge more complex than that facing teachers of any other foreign language in the American educational system, including Japanese and Arabic—and this on top of all the curricular problems they also face. Here is more evidence that the task they have undertaken is enormous.

How much of this ethnic diversity do the teachers in the Dodge-supported programs actually encounter? Overall, 33.3 percent of the 1,783 students in the high school sample reported that they came from a family in which Chinese was spoken. As might be expected, however, these students were distributed unevenly among the programs. Only 50 percent of the teachers reported that any of their students brought knowledge of one of the Chinese regional languages to the classroom. For those who reported having home-learned-Chinese students in the classroom, the mean percentage of such students was 30.1 percent. In one school 95 percent of the students had prior knowledge of Chinese; more commonly (in 38.7 percent of the schools), those speaking Chinese at home comprised less than 10 percent of the students. However, of the 29 percent of the students in the classrooms who spoke Chinese at home, more than half (57.4 percent) spoke a regional language other than Mandarin. To make matters even more complex, about half (52.0 percent) of the programs reported significant numbers of students (11.7 percent, on the average) who spoke other Asian languages at home. In one school as many as 80 percent of the students were from other Asian ethnic groups, principally Vietnamese or Cambodian.

For half of the schools, therefore, the home language of the students can be an important consideration in conducting Chinese classes. Most of the students in these schools are naive learners, with no previous exposure to Chinese. However, almost 20 percent of them have already been exposed to either Mandarin or another regional Chinese language from home use, and this immensely complicates classroom practice. Students who speak Mandarin at home have already attained some level of competency in vocabulary, syntax, and pronunciation. They need to learn the writing system so that they can become literate in their language, and they must be taught the formal Chinese—often, the more current forms—that they are not likely to have learned at home. For students who speak varying amounts of another regional Chinese language at home, the burden becomes heavier and often includes blocking interference of one language with a second—for example, the interference of Cantonese with Mandarin. For the 11 percent of the students who come from a background in which another Asian language is spoken, it is likely that they have a passing acquaintance with Chinese; for much of Southeast Asia it is the major reference language. Some of the students will be familiar with languages that are tonal; others will know something about using a writing system that is nonalphabetic; still others may know some Chinese from borrowings into their native language.

Hence, for many teachers the composition of the Chinese classroom is heterogeneous and the learning needs of the students quite varied. Native English-speaking teachers who work in this environment say that before they can make any headway with the Asian students, the first lesson they need to get across is that the students do not know the language—at least to the extent they think they do. To convince them, the teachers have to talk fast and furious. Once they get the attention of these students, however, they can get down to the business of instruction—always being prepared, however, for another challenge to their authority and competency. The teacher must also keep the non-Chinese-heritage students from being overwhelmed by the native speakers' initial advantage. It makes for lively classes, innovative lesson plans, and exhausted teachers.

The logical response to the extreme diversity of the students would be to put them in separate classrooms. Wouldn't it solve the problem, at least in part, to place some of the Chinese-heritage students in advanced classes so as to reduce the contrast with the naive learners? In fact, some of the Chinese students do start higher. While 72.2 percent of the non-Chinese students are found in first-level classes, only 39.8 percent of the Chinese students are in that level. The proportion of Chinese students increases with each course level. In the first-level classes 27.8 percent of the students have been exposed to Chinese at home, while in the fourth- and fifth-level classes that proportion has risen to 50.0 percent. Nonetheless, mixed rather than segregated classes are the rule. Only one teacher reported having the luxury of a separate class for students entering the program with a Chinese background. In the other programs, more than one-fourth of the first-level students have Chinese spoken at home, and at every level the mix of English- and Chinese-home students is substantial.

Teachers having both types of student face the problem of how to cope with those who have some prior knowledge of the language. Do you give them placement tests? Do you use different standards to evaluate their performance? Do you use them as teaching assistants? How do you satisfy the needs of both sets of students? Several of the survey questions focused on this issue.

First of all, placement of students with prior knowledge of Chinese was usually quite casual. Only 38 percent of the teachers gave a placement test to such students. Second, English-speaking students expressed some fear that the presence of native speakers in the class would skew the grade distribution; no matter how diligently they worked, their grades would not be commensurate with the Chinese students'. This fear is not entirely unfounded. Only one-third of the teachers reported that they evaluated native speakers by a standard different from that used for English speakers. At the same time, the Chinese-origin students did get higher grades in Chinese—a mean grade point average (GPA) of 3.6, compared with 3.4 for the English-speaking students. This difference is statistically significant. In fact, Chinese-origin students reported better grades than English speakers for their courses overall—a GPA of 3.5, compared with 3.3 for the English speakers. Again, this difference is statistically significant. Most teachers reported that they did not grade the two groups on different scales. It might be argued that what is being evaluated in a foreign language classroom is the product—the student's ability to use the language to perform some assigned task; how the student got to that point is irrelevant. This is not, however, an argument that will encourage English-speaking students to take a chance at learning a foreign language when they perceive that they come to the classroom with a severe handicap.

There are, of course, clear benefits to having Chinese-heritage students in the classroom. Thirty-five percent of the teachers said that they tried to take advantage of these students' prior knowledge of Chinese—for example, getting them to work with the naive students as speech models. The truth is that it would probably be impossible to keep the two groups of students apart—with the native speakers showing off their abilities, passing on the scatological vocabulary items that high school students put such a high priority on learning, and even making constructive comments on the progress of the others. As always, the teacher's challenge is to make the best of the situation so that by the end of the year all the students, whatever their abilities and backgrounds, have gained something from the course. Teachers cannot always organize their students into the homogeneous classes that might best serve their needs. They are bounded by the constraints of the system and must work imaginatively and constructively within those boundaries to achieve their goals.

While the presence of students with home-learned Chinese in the classroom affects teaching strategies and the motivation of the English-speaking learners, there is another way of considering the matter. While this was not the intention of the Dodge Foundation, and was not explicitly mentioned by any of the teachers or principals, the teaching of Chinese at the high school level is an experiment in an undertaking that should be more clearly on the American agenda. The United States has large and growing ethnic minority populations. Surely one of the issues on the national agenda is how to upgrade and utilize the language skills of these ethnic groups. A close examination of the effect of the Dodge program from this perspective would be a useful next step.[2]

---

[2] Another area needing a thorough examination is the role of "Saturday schools" as a language maintenance mechanism. The American Folklife Center has produced a book addressing the issue of Saturday schools among several ethnic groups: *Ethnic Heritage and Language Schools in America* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1988), developed by Elena Bradunas, compiled and edited by Brett Topping. The general procedure was to look at one school as prototypical and to develop a typology rather than to undertake a cross-sectional analysis. It is the analysis that is needed.

Experience with Other Languages

While only a minority of the students in the programs had any prior experience with Chinese, a substantial number (78.8 percent) began to study Chinese after having already studied another foreign language. For almost all those students (98.2 percent) that language was Spanish, French, or German, in that order. Japanese had been studied by 2.4 percent of the students and Russian by 1.4 percent. The ordering of languages taken follows national enrollment patterns. A surprising number of students (19.9 percent) had studied more than one foreign language before taking Chinese. The experience of having studied at least one other foreign language was quite evenly distributed among the different kinds of students. Girls, private school students, and nonethnic students were slightly more likely to have taken another foreign language than were boys, public school students, and ethnic Chinese students, but the differences were so small as to be essentially meaningless.

This can be a boon for the Chinese high school teacher, although many do not recognize the fact. Within the high school context these students are generally sophisticated foreign language learners. They know what a foreign language is; they have some understanding of how one goes about learning one; they have language-learning skills that a teacher can build on. While high school Chinese language teachers usually feel frustrated by the fact that the school administration and other foreign language teachers require students to have taken a commonly taught language before enrolling in a Chinese class, this may have positive as well as negative consequences. Having students in the class who already know that pronunciation is important, that small changes in orthography may change the meaning of a word, and that the cadence of a language may vary from English—all this can make the task of teaching this difficult language more manageable.

Why Study Chinese?

Since taking Chinese is invariably optional rather than required, the students' motivation is of obvious interest. Was it curiosity, parental pressure, preparation for college or future careers, the importance of China, personal friendships? In order to develop a list of possible reasons, we examined a set of essays written by students explaining why they wanted to study Chinese; these came from a program that required an essay from each prospective student as a prerequisite for admission. From these essays we developed a list of the ten most common reasons for studying Chinese. In the questionnaire the students were asked to examine the list twice, first checking all their reasons for wanting to study Chinese, and then checking the single most important one.

Most students had a fairly clear idea of why they had chosen to study Chinese. The answers contained some surprises. They are grouped below by broad category of response.

Intellectual Reasons

The highest frequency of response was given to reasons that were primarily intellectual rather than instrumental or personal. More than half of the students (52.7 percent) indicated that they were studying Chinese primarily for one of these essentially intellectual reasons: curiosity, the challenge of studying something different, or the importance of the country.

Curiosity about the language and culture. The reason most frequently cited (by 70.8 percent of the students) was simple curiosity. It was also given as the single most important reason by 34.5 percent of the students. This finding was surprising, for principals and teachers tended to stress instrumental rather than intellectual reasons as the prime motivators of students. Another hypotheses of the survey turned out to be equally false. It was assumed that the merely curious would have dropped out early, and that students sticking with it into the upper levels would give more instrumental reasons for taking the language. In fact, the proportion of students citing curiosity as a reason for taking Chinese increased as students advanced: 71 percent of the students in level 1 gave this as their most important reason, 73 percent of those in level 2, and 74 percent of those in level 3. However, only 60 percent of those enrolled in levels 4 and 5 gave curiosity as their primary reason for taking the language. Even though the percentage increases are small and there is a substantial drop in the importance of curiosity at the highest level, the importance and durability of a noninstrumental reason is striking. Perhaps equally surprising is that curiosity is also an important reason for 60 percent of the ethnic Chinese students. As will be noted later, this factor is considerably more important than parental pressure.

Desire to study something different. The wish to study something different, another noninstrumental motivation, was the second most frequently cited reason for enrolling in Chinese. A full 56.0 percent of the students selected it as a reason, and 11.9 percent chose it as the most important reason. It was selected as often by girls as by boys; less often by those at the upper course levels than by the beginners; and, as might be expected, more often by English speakers (67 percent) than by ethnic Chinese (35 percent).

Importance of China/Chinese. A third intellectual reason—the importance of China and Chinese—was indicated by 44.5 percent of the students as one reason for studying Chinese. It was indicated by 12.1 percent to be the most important reason. Neither gender, ethnicity, nor course level made any difference in the proportion of students offering this reason.

Instrumental Reasons

A number of students chose one or both of two goal-oriented reasons for studying Chinese: getting into college and getting a job. In all, 18.6 percent of the students chose one or the other of these as their most important reason for studying Chinese.

College admission. A number of principals and teachers suggested that some students enrolled in Chinese primarily because it would look good on their transcripts and help them get into a more prestigious college. It turned out that students were not quite as college-oriented as suspected. Less than half (42.7 percent) gave enhanced chances for college admission as a reason for studying Chinese, and only 6.2 percent gave it as their principal reason. Boys seemed to be more college-oriented than girls; girls accounted for only 38 percent of those citing improved chances for college admission as a reason. Ethnic Chinese cited this reason less frequently (35 percent).

Job opportunities. It was surprising to find that even in high school, some students have a strong occupational reason for taking Chinese. Over half of the students (53 percent) claimed that one of their reasons for taking Chinese was the feeling that it would enhance future job opportunities. As will be noted later, students were less clear about precisely what jobs they were likely to get, but the fact that they had studied Chinese was somehow seen as an advantage in the job market.

Personal Reasons

It is part of the general lore about course-taking behavior that students select courses not for their intellectual interest or for instrumental reasons, but for personal reasons that have nothing to do with content or utility. These noninstrumental, personal reasons include parental pressure; the influence of a friend—either an ethnic Chinese or someone taking the course; a general feeling of compulsion; or previous travel to China. In all, 11.8 percent of the students cited one of these as their principal reason for studying Chinese.

Parental interest/pressure. The students were first asked if there had been any parental pressure involved in their decision to sign up for Chinese. A little over one-fourth (26.5 percent) said that parental *interest* was one reason, but only 6.1 percent gave it as the primary reason. "Interest" is stressed here because most of the students admitting to parental influence crossed out "pressure" as being a reason. In fact, on one of the site visits, when a group of students were asked if parents had played an important part in their decision to take Chinese, one student answered unequivocally that if his parents had wanted him to take the course, he would not have done so. Most students were not so adamant, but in general, the role of parents in the decision to enroll in Chinese seemed surprisingly weak. The only situation in which parental interest was important was with ethnic Chinese students: 47.0 percent of those students reported that parental interest was important, although even among them only 12.5 percent gave it as their most important reason.

Influence of a friend or acquaintance. Two choices were included to explore the role of personal friendships and the student grapevine in the decision to take Chinese. This factor seems to have played a marginal role in course selection. Less than one-fourth of the students (22.0 percent) indicated that their decision had been influenced somewhat by advice from someone who had taken the course and liked it; however, only 2.8 percent gave this as the primary reason. Similarly, only 10.1 percent were recruited by a Chinese friend, and only 2.3 percent indicated that this was the main reason.

Travel to China. As might be expected, only a small percentage of the students indicated that having traveled to a Chinese-speaking country influenced their decision to study Chinese. Unlike travel to some of the European countries, the incidence of travel to China is generally far too low among American high school students for this to be a major factor. Only 9.9 percent indicated that travel to China played a role in their taking Chinese, and less than 1.0 percent gave it as a primary reason. Indeed, it was primarily ethnic Chinese who cited this particular reason. The relatively low percentage of students citing travel to China as a reason is a bit surprising, for 28.1 percent of the students said that they had visited China, and as many as 70.9 percent of the ethnic Chinese said that they had been there. An even greater proportion (44.2 percent) indicated that they expected to visit China by the time they finished high school. For ethnic Chinese, the proportion was higher still (52.2 percent). One can only conclude that travel to China is only loosely linked to motives for studying Chinese.

Compulsion

To flush out any feelings on the part of the students that taking Chinese was somehow compulsory, one of the choices offered was simply that the student "had to" take Chinese. In fact, 16.1 percent of the students checked this response, and 3.9 percent marked it as their first choice. Interviews with students who responded in this fashion indicated that in general this statement was used to convey a set of unspecified personal and situational factors that had brought the student to take Chinese. This response was chosen most frequently by the ethnic Chinese: 36.0 percent of them chose it, compared with only 5.9 percent of English speakers. Their free comments suggest that they felt somehow compelled because of their ethnic background to study their ancestral language. In the commonly taught languages students interpreted this item as implying some kind of high school graduation requirement or college entrance requirement. Except for students of an ethnic Chinese background, students basically chose this response as a cop-out, when they could not come up with any definite reason as to why they were taking Chinese. Curiously, the percentage of students who selected this reason increased with the level of instruction, from 12 percent in level 1 to 22 percent in level 4. Gender did not make much difference—there was a 1 percentage point difference between boys and girls, with boys being slightly more inclined to select this as a reason. The largest difference was between the ethnic Chinese and the nonethnic students. In this case, 36 percent of the ethnic Chinese chose this response, compared with 6 percent of the nonethnic students.

Miscellaneous Reasons

As might be expected, there were a number of miscellaneous responses not included in the formal list. A number of ethnic Chinese (4.1 percent) referred specifically to their heritage, and a few (1.4 percent) indicated that the reputation of the teacher was the primary motivator. Another 7.3 percent checked the general category of "other" reasons without specifying them.

Enrollment Levels

When do students take Chinese and how much do they take? To understand the special pattern of enrollments in high school Chinese, two classifications have to be introduced: the class of the student (freshman, etc.) and the level of the course (stated by year, from 1 to 4). Table 6.1 shows the representation of each class in each course level. The next-to-last column shows the distribution by class for all levels, and the next-to-last row the distribution by level for all classes. (For example, 3.4 percent of all level 1 students are in junior high; junior high students account for 2.0 percent of all enrollments; and 47.8 percent of all students are enrolled in level 1.) The small category "other" includes a few graduates staying on to take more Chinese plus one middle-aged adult admitted as a special student in one high school.

Table 6.1: Distribution of Students by Class and Course Level (percent)

Class	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4/5	All Levels Percent	All Levels Number
Junior high	3.4	0.8	0.4	—	2.0	35
Freshman	29.9	4.6	4.5	0.6	17.0	291
Sophomore	23.2	40.0	15.4	8.5	26.4	452
Junior	21.5	26.3	50.2	21.2	27.7	476
Senior	16.8	24.5	28.3	66.7	26.1	447
Other	0.8	—	0.4	1.8	0.8	13
All classes						
Percent	47.8	28.4	14.3	9.5	100.0	—
Number	820	486	245	163	—	1,714

Note: Missing cases = 69.

Source: High school student questionnaire.

The table illustrates some of the special features of high school Chinese enrollments. The fact that more sophomores take Chinese than freshmen and that the percentages are relatively stable after that reflects two tendencies: students turn to Chinese after having taken another language, and schools restrict admission to the upper grades so as not to compete for enrollments with Western European languages. Ethnic Chinese account for the presence of lowerclassmen in the fourth and fifth levels. The pattern is very unlike what would be found in a similar table for French, Spanish, or German, where enrollments by class level would be heavily concentrated on the diagonal. That is, level 1 French would be taken mostly by junior high students or freshmen, level 2 by sophomores, and so forth. Of course, the extension of foreign language instruction into elementary schools might change this pattern, but it is unlikely that seniors and juniors would enroll in beginning French. A little calculation shows just how unusual the pattern for Chinese is: 32.2 percent of the seniors studying Chinese are at the first level, 27.5 percent are at the second, 15.7 percent are at the third, and only 24.6 percent are at the fourth or fifth, where they would normally be concentrated in one of the commonly taught languages.

The "all classes" row of Table 6.1 indicates the extent to which students continue their study of Chinese into the upper levels—how much Chinese they actually take. At first glance, the numbers seem to follow the pattern that is almost universal for all languages, whereby enrollments decrease by about 50 percent per year. In these schools, the second level has about 59.3 percent of the enrollments in the first level; the third has 50.4 percent of those in the second; and the fourth/fifth has 66.5 percent of those in the third. However, there are several features of Chinese language instruction that make these figures misleading. There are three basic reasons why students do not continue from one year to another: the student drops the course; the student graduates or transfers to another school; or the school does not offer a course in Chinese at the next level.

To explore the continuation and attrition process, each high school principal was asked to consult school records, take a cohort of students enrolled in level 1 Chinese in either 1985 or 1986, and trace their careers over the subsequent four years, indicating for each year whether they continued with Chinese, they dropped the course, they left the school, or the school did not offer Chinese at the next level. Of the forty-two schools returning principal's questionnaires, twenty-one were able to provide this information. Table 6.2 presents the results. Note that the number of students in this tabulation of cohorts is a little different from the one-time cross-sectional inventory derived from the student questionnaires.

Table 6.2: Year-to-Year Enrollment Attrition, by Cause (percent)

Level	Enrolled	Dropping Course	Leaving School	Program Ceases	Number of Students
Level 1	100.0	—	—	—	750
Level 2	58.8	10.5	30.7	—	441
Level 3	43.4	7.9	23.8	24.9	191
Level 4	36.1	8.9	20.4	34.6	69

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

A close examination of the table is instructive. The last column indicates that out of a cohort of 750 students in first-level Chinese in 1985 or 1986, 441 were still studying it in the second year, 191 in the third, and only 69 in the fourth. Thus, only 9.2 percent of the students starting out reached the fourth level. In this respect Chinese appears to be like all the other languages taught in high schools: few students receive very much instruction, and it is concentrated at the lower levels. However, the other columns indicate how enrollment changes in Chinese are unlike those in the European languages, where declines are largely due to a student's voluntary dropping of the courses. In Chinese the main reasons for declining enrollments are reflected in the "leaving school" and "program ceases" columns. The late start that is characteristic of many students in high school Chinese means that a substantial number of them will graduate before reaching upper-level courses. Attrition is also largely due to limitations in the program offerings. Of the twenty-one schools responding, only twelve offered four years of Chinese; two offered three years; and seven offered only two. Hence, students in some of these schools simply could not have taken advanced-level Chinese even if they had chosen to. Table 6.3 shows the overall effect of these different causes of student attrition.

Table 6.3: Overall Student Attrition, by Cause (percent)

Cause	Percent
Completing level 4	9.2
Dropping course	17.4
Leaving school	49.9
Program ceases	23.5

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

Clearly, structural factors, not lack of student motivation, are the primary reason for the low level of competency students attain in their study of Chinese. To make this point as clear as possible, Table 6.4 shows what the continuation rate is for students who do not leave school and are in programs offering the full four years of instruction.

Table 6.4: Percentage of Students Continuing Chinese, When Continuation Is Possible

Extent of Continuation	Percent
From level 1 to level 2	84.2
From level 2 to level 3	84.5
From level 3 to level 4	80.2

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

The table demonstrates that students taking Chinese in high school are a dedicated group. They would take enough Chinese to matter if they could, but the system will not let them. Given the difficulty of the language and the sheer investment of time it takes to gain proficiency, it is sad that the opportunity does not exist for many of the students to complete a full sequence of training in high school.

Time Spent Studying Chinese

From the distribution of enrollments by level, discussed in the preceding section, we can estimate how many students receive how many years altogether of high school Chinese language instruction. The time they commit to studying Chinese can be divided into two components—classroom time and homework time.

Classroom Time

The students' most important time commitment is time spent in the classroom, for it is here that new concepts are introduced and acquisition is checked. Table 6.5, which was extrapolated from the data on completion and attrition, indicates for the students beginning Chinese in either 1985 or 1986 the percentage completing one to four years of study.

Table 6.5: Percentage of Students Completing One to Four Years of High School Chinese

Years Completed	Percent
One year	41.2
Two years	33.3
Three years	16.3
Four years	9.2

Source: Principal's questionnaire.

It is clear from the table that most students get relatively modest amounts of Chinese in high school. Indeed, about three-quarters of them receive two years or less of coursework, and approximately half get only one year.

It will be recalled that the teachers estimated that they devoted about 3.5 hours to Chinese class time per week. Assuming a full thirty-six weeks in the school year, a classroom year of Chinese amounts to about 126 hours of instruction. The implication is that for most students, high school instruction can provide only a start at learning Chinese. This is particularly true for what the federal government refers to as a Category 4 language, one that typically takes American students four times as long to learn as French or Spanish.

Homework Time

It is possible, of course, to compensate for limited classroom time by spending a great deal of time studying Chinese outside of class. How much time is spent on homework? The teachers estimated that students were assigned approximately 7.4 hours of homework per week. However, students reported that they actually spent considerably less time than that on homework—commonly about 3 hours per week, with the bulk of the responses ranging between 1 and 5 hours per week. On the average the students reported that they spent 3 hours and 35 minutes per week studying Chinese outside of class, or about 43 minutes per school day. There was a great deal of variation both among individual students and among schools. The answers ranged from 70 hours per week, to only before a test, to never.[3] Private school students reported spending 4 hours and 20 minutes per week studying Chinese (52 minutes per school day), and public school students reported spending 3 hours and 10 minutes per week (38 minutes per day). At the school whose students spent the least amount of time outside of class studying Chinese, the figure reported was 1 hour and 45 minutes per week (21 minutes per school day); at the school whose students spent the most time, the figure was 6 hours and 5 minutes per week (1 hour and 15 minutes per school day).

Whatever the variations among students and schools, the evidence is that for most students, classroom time plus time spent on homework amounts to a considerable commitment of effort. Even though high school students are not efficient managers of time and the time they devote to homework may not be of high quality, their commitment is still clearly evident. If the students' estimate of homework time is accepted, the study of Chinese in and out of the classroom takes 7.1 hours per week. If the teachers' estimate of homework time is accepted, it amounts to 10.9 hours per week.

The basic question, of course, is how much competency in Chinese this time spent both in and out of class provides. There is no precise answer to this question. It is unrealistic to use the federal government's estimate that it takes 1,320 contact hours to reach a modest level 2 competency—that is, the ability "to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements." Government language schools provide intensive instruction, and the students there fully expect to use their language skills on the job soon after the completion of a course. One of the most pressing needs for Chinese instruction at the high school level—or for that matter the college level—is the development of realistic standards for what can be achieved in a difficult language like Chinese in the amount of time teachers and students can devote to it. However, given the limited number of years students are able to commit to the study of Chinese and the limited number of hours per week they can study it either in the classroom or as homework, it still seems clear that most students cannot get very far in learning Chinese in the high school setting. They are further handicapped by the fact that most schools do not offer a full four-year program in Chinese, and that the teaching materials that could help them have yet to be developed.

---

[3] The student reporting 70 hours per week was excluded from the calculation of the mean as an outrider whose behavior would unduly affect the results. On the other hand, students who reported that they never studied Chinese were included in the calculations.

This combination of facts has three clear implications. First, if a satisfactory plateau of competency in Chinese is to be attained in high school, the number of years students can study it there must be increased, and/or it must be offered to primary or middle school students. Given the high continuation rates among those who can continue from one year to the next, this means changing the system so that it is possible for students to complete more years of Chinese before graduating from high school. Second, instruction in Chinese in high school can be adjusted to take account of the fact that most students will achieve a very low level of proficiency. Course goals can be altered to place greater emphasis on obtaining a general familiarity with the language, on becoming good learners of Chinese, and on studying the culture. Third, the study of Chinese in high school can be viewed as the beginning of a longer learning process stretching on into college.

Looking to the Future: What the High School Students Plan

The third option—treating high school as the initial stage of a longer learning process—is the most sensible one. While many students will have no more than a high school experience of studying Chinese, indications are that many others expect to continue to study the language in college. Given the fact that it takes so many years to learn Chinese, it must be stressed that in Chinese, even more so than in the commonly taught languages, the articulation of what happens in high school with what happens in college is of vital importance. Accordingly, the discussion now looks ahead to college—initially from the perspective of students still in high school, and then by examining what has happened to students who have begun their college careers.

College Choices

A series of questions on the high school student questionnaire asked the students to look ahead, indicating where they expected to go and what they expected to do in college and in their subsequent careers. It should be understood that a number of these students were so early in their school standing that guesses about the future were very hypothetical. It should also be recalled that these students had enrolled in Chinese primarily for intellectual reasons—curiosity, taking on a challenge, learning about another society—rather than for instrumental reasons. Nonetheless, students' expectations about utilizing their Chinese training are important considerations for teachers and program administrators at both the high school and the college level.

For almost all the students, no matter what their class in school, the question was not whether they would go to college—97 percent expected to attend college—but where. Students were asked to name two institutions to which they intended to apply. The colleges and universities named were then classified as to whether they were in or out of the state in which the high school was located, to give some sense of cosmopolitan versus local orientation; the academic quality of the institution was estimated following the ratings of institutional selectivity included in *Barron's Guide to Colleges, 1986;* and a check was made as to whether the institution was known to offer Chinese.

Students mentioned 309 different colleges or universities as choices. The range represents a continuum from community colleges to specialized schools such as the Rhode Island School of Design, and from local state universities to Oxford and Cambridge. The most frequently mentioned choices were Harvard, Stanford, Yale, Princeton, and UCLA; these schools accounted for 20 percent of the responses. Of the top twelve institutions, only one (MIT) did not offer a Chinese language instructional program. Two-thirds of the top twelve were private institutions, and one-third were large state institutions.

The students' choices were academically ambitious. Table 6.6 indicates the relative selectivity of their college choices. Since the students were not asked to rank the two schools they mentioned as top choices, the data are combined in a single table. The percentages are based on the 2,580 different college choices made by the 1,436 students responding. Since students attending private schools might be expected to aspire to academically more demanding colleges and universities, the table lists public and private school students separately.

Table 6.6: Selectivity of College Choices of High School Students (percent)

College Choice	Public School Students	Private School Students	All Students
Community college	1.4	0.5	1.1
Special	0.8	0.8	0.8
Noncompetitive	3.2	1.2	2.5
Less competitive	3.7	0.8	2.8
Competitive	17.2	5.8	13.5
Very competitive	24.5	14.8	21.3
Highly competitive	13.8	23.6	17.0
Most competitive	34.6	51.9	40.2
Foreign	0.8	0.6	0.7

Source: High school student questionnaire.

The table indicates that students taking Chinese in high school are academically ambitious. More than three-fourths (78.5 percent) intend to go to schools that are very competitive or higher in academic rating. The selectivity of the college aspired to is one of the few areas in which public and private school students are differentiated. More than one-half of the students in private schools aspire to the most selective institutions—the

Oberlins and Reeds, the Harvards and Yales—while only about one-third of the public school students aspire to such schools. It is probable, however, that this difference actually reflects the economic status of the students in private schools and their families' ability to afford the higher tuition of the most selective colleges. As has been shown earlier, the academic performance of the two sets of students is comparable.

Most of the students expect to go away to college. Only one-third of them expect to attend a college in the state in which they went to high school. Again, there is a difference between public and private school students—37 percent of the public school students expect to attend an in-state college, as opposed to only 22 percent of the private school students. This difference again probably indicates the private school students' ability to afford the greater expense of attending an out-of-state institution.

Intended Majors

Public versus private school attendance has considerably less effect on the majors students intend to pursue in college. Accordingly, the data in this area are not differentiated between public and private schools. Students were asked to list two subjects they thought they might choose as a major in college. Since they were not asked to rank their two choices, the data are combined in a single table. Their expectations are presented in Table 6.7 in fairly broad categories, reflecting the generality of the students' choices. The majors are grouped into general disciplines.

Table 6.7: Distribution of Intended Majors

Major	Percent	
Humanities		23.6
General humanities	15.2	
Chinese	4.3	
Other languages and linguistics	4.1	
Social sciences		16.6
General social sciences	13.6	
East Asian studies	3.0	
Biological and physical sciences		15.4
Biological sciences	5.4	
Physical sciences	7.5	
Computer and information sciences	2.5	
Applied and professional disciplines		44.4
Architecture	2.6	
Business	16.6	
Communications	3.3	
Education	2.2	
Engineering	8.0	
Health professions	6.2	
Law	4.6	
Miscellaneous	0.9	

Source: High school student questionnaire.

The table demonstrates that like most other high school students, students taking Chinese intend to pursue a wide variety of majors in college. (Again, it should be remembered that some of these students are at a very early stage of their schooling and have only the most general notion of what choosing a college major entails.) Relatively few expect to enter a specialty specifically concerned with the Chinese language or culture (7.3 percent in Chinese and East Asian studies combined). Indeed, like most high school students they have a decidedly practical bent—the most commonly intended majors are in the applied and professional specialties rather than the liberal arts.

Even with this practical orientation, 70 percent of the students say that they will continue to study Chinese in college, and another 7 percent say that they might. This intention to continue studying Chinese prevails regardless of the choice of major. Table 6.8 shows, for the various majors, the percentage of students who say that they will definitely continue their study of Chinese in college. Again, the majors are divided into general disciplines.

Table 6.8: Percentage of Students Planning to Continue Studying Chinese, by Intended Major

Major	**Percent**	
Humanities		80.3
General humanities	75.9	
Chinese	100.0	
Social sciences		81.7
General social sciences	79.2	
East Asian studies	92.8	
Biological and physical sciences		64.4
Biological sciences	72.4	
Physical sciences	62.4	
Computer and information sciences	55.4	
Applied and professional disciplines		67.7
Architecture	73.3	
Business	68.7	
Communications	62.0	
Education	62.0	
Engineering	61.7	
Health professions	65.6	
Law	76.6	
Miscellaneous	62.5	

Source: High school student questionnaire.

The students planning to continue studying Chinese are most heavily concentrated in the social sciences, followed by the humanities. What is more surprising is that two-thirds of the students interested in applied and professional areas expect to continue studying Chinese—about the same number as in the natural sciences.

Career Plans of High School Students

In addition to their choices of majors in college, the students were asked to take a somewhat longer look and to speculate on what their future career trajectories might be. Once again, they were asked to indicate two choices, and these choices have been combined in a single table. The percentages in Table 6.9 indicate the proportion of students who chose each career as one of their two options. Since a number of students indicated more than one career, the total adds up to more than 100 percent. However, it was the distribution of career choices that was of interest, rather than the distribution of students.

Table 6.9: Career Choices of High School Students

Career	Percent
Business	35.5
Chinese-related Ph.D.	4.3
Education	9.5
Engineering	17.8
Health professions	13.9
International affairs	15.2
Law	11.6
Scientific research	10.3
Other	16.6
Undecided	9.9

Note: N = 1,783.

Source: High school student questionnaire.

The career choices mirror, in somewhat exaggerated fashion, the same preferences seen in the intended majors. Business is even more predominant as a career choice than as a major. Engineering is also a very popular choice, followed by international affairs. Only 4.3 percent of the students expect to go into an occupation specifically related to Chinese, and perhaps most telling of all, only 9.5 percent intend to go into education at any level.

Given that these career expectations are heavily tilted toward applied fields, do these students believe that they will use their competency in Chinese in their future careers? Table 6.10 provides an answer to that question.

Table 6.10: Percentage of High School Students Expecting to Use Their Chinese Professionally, by Career

Career	Percent
Business	71.3
Chinese-related Ph.D.	92.1
Education	58.3
Engineering	60.0
Health professions	51.6
International affairs	79.1
Law	59.1
Scientific research	57.6
Other	50.4
All students	60.5

Note: N = 1,783.

Source: High school student questionnaire.

A large portion of these students do expect to use Chinese in their careers. This desire is strongest among those who expect to earn a Chinese-related Ph.D. and those who expect to do something in international affairs or in business. It is sad to note that these expectations are probably very unrealistic. If current trends continue, these students are unlikely to attain a high enough proficiency to use Chinese occupationally even if they pursue their studies from high school through college. Additionally, all of the evidence indicates that there is a relatively low level of occupational demand in the United States for use of foreign languages, including Asian languages.[4] A session at a recent meeting of business school administrators yielded a telling anecdote. An MBA student who had spent the previous summer as an intern in Hong Kong reported being queried during that internship by a high-level American executive from the home office; the executive wanted to know why the student was so intent on learning Chinese when that expertise would only result in his being classified as a mere translator, not as someone on the upper-management fast track. Nevertheless, from a policy point of view, these data suggest that students moving into college-level Chinese courses have both an intrinsic interest in Chinese and a more instrumental one. Two issues must be faced at the collegiate level: at what point in the curriculum to address the professional interests of students, and how best to serve those who may expect to use Chinese in a nonacademic career as well as those who have an intrinsic interest in the language.

---

[4] See *Foreign Language in the Workplace*, ed. Richard D. Lambert and Sarah J. Moore, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 511 (September 1990).

Articulation of High School and College Chinese: What the College Students Experience

Because it takes so long to attain even minimal proficiency in a language like Chinese, and because students can actually spend only a limited amount of time learning it in high school, a great deal of attention should be paid to assuring that what happens in high school is well articulated with what happens in college. This is a problem in the commonly taught languages as well, but in that case articulation is somewhat facilitated by graduated text materials and by the existence of nationally normed achievement and advanced placement tests. None of these exist for Chinese, although the creation of a College Board achievement test, an endeavor now under way, may help matters somewhat. However, in the absence of curricular consensus—a lack noted throughout this report—the need for direct concern with issues of articulation is extremely pressing. It is the students who pay for poor articulation because of the lack of cumulativeness in what they learn.

To shed some light on what actually happens as students move from one educational level to the next, the survey designed a questionnaire for students who had graduated from the Dodge high school programs and gone on to college. With the help of teachers and school administrators, some 476 graduates were identified and sent questionnaires. Of these, 211 responded. The college sample is a little different from the high school sample in that it contained slightly more graduates of private high schools than public ones: 43.3 percent of the college sample had gone to private schools, as opposed to 31.6 percent of the high school sample. Similarly, the college sample slightly reversed the sex ratio: 45.0 percent males in the college sample, compared with 57.5 percent in the high school sample. And the proportion of ethnic Chinese students fell from 33.5 percent in the high school sample to 17.9 percent in the college sample. As noted earlier, however, only a few findings were markedly affected by these student characteristics, and such differences will be noted only in those instances. For the most part, the private and public school students will be combined in the analysis that follows.

First of all, how many students who went on to college did in fact continue to study Chinese? In all, 64.9 percent continued to study Chinese in college. Curiously, this is very close to the percentage of students in the high school sample (60.5 percent) who indicated that they intended to continue. Private school students were somewhat more likely to continue than public school students (75.0 percent as opposed to 58.1 percent).

Placement Level

A major issue in the high school/college articulation debate is the placement of entering college students who have already begun their education in Chinese. How much does their high school Chinese count for when they enter college? Table 6.11 indicates the level of the Chinese class in which the program alumni were first placed.

Table 6.11: Level of First Chinese Course in College

Term or Course	Percent of Students
First	43.4
Second	22.1
Third	20.7
Fourth	2.8
Fifth	3.4
Sixth or higher	4.6

Source: College student questionnaire.

The table suggests that most students are not given many placement credits for having begun their pursuit of Chinese in high school. Almost half of them went into the first course when they arrived at college, and two-thirds went into the first year—either the first- or the second-term course. It is interesting to note that the percentage entering the first-term course in college Chinese is almost exactly the same as the percentage who completed only one year of high school Chinese. Similarly, about one-third of the students took two years of high school Chinese, which is about the same as the proportion who were placed in the second- or third-term course. The rule of thumb seems to be that one year of high school Chinese language training is approximately equal to one term of a college program. This finding makes for an even more troubling estimate of the number of years of high school Chinese required for a student to reach level 2 competency; the actual amount of time required would appear to be double the earlier estimate. Even with four years of high school Chinese, entry into the second year of college Chinese appears problematic. Some students do in fact learn enough in high school to achieve advanced placement in college, and they are not, as might be expected, all ethnic Chinese. In fact, only one out of the seven students placing beyond the fourth term was an ethnic Chinese.

Matching High School and College Chinese

The issue of articulation between high school and college is not limited to questions of placement. An equally important question is the extent to which there is continuity in pedagogical styles so that students can make a smooth transition from one level to another. Both the high school teachers and the college students were asked whether they thought there were major problems in making this transition and, if so, what those problems were. Table 6.12 presents both their responses.

Table 6.12: Areas of Difficulty in the Transition from High School to College as Reported by Graduates of High School Chinese Programs and Teachers

Area	Percent of Graduates	Percent of Teachers
Any problems at all in transition from high school to college	20.8	22.9
Placement procedures	14.2	18.8
Performance expectations	8.5	14.6
High school preparation	—	8.3
Different focus in college	—	37.5
Changed teaching materials	15.7	—
Pace of course	18.5	33.3
Emphasis on reading	8.1	—
Emphasis on speaking	13.3	—
Switching to traditional characters	4.3	10.4
Switching to simplified characters	16.6	10.4
Different romanization system	4.7	25.0

Note: Trouble with the romanization system was an explanation volunteered by some of the students. It was not listed as a choice on the questionnaire; if it had been, the percentage might have been greater.

Source: College student questionnaire and teacher's questionnaire.

What stands out is a general sense that students appear to make the transition from high school to college Chinese fairly easily. Only 20 to 25 percent of the students indicated having had any problems moving from high school to college Chinese. Students expressed having the greatest trouble with the pacing of college Chinese courses compared with what they were used to. This difficulty is coupled with adjusting to a different set of learning materials. Another problem was switching to the use of simplified characters rather than traditional ones. Also causing some distress was the emphasis placed on speaking Chinese, followed by the emphasis on reading. There is a great deal of similarity between what students report having experienced and what the teachers report having been told in student feedback. The focus and pacing of the course are the areas in which teachers report students having the greatest difficulty, followed by the use of a different romanization system and the switch to a different type of characters. In other words, the transition to college appears to proceed rather smoothly. What the students learn in high school prepares them fairly well for the next stage. It is only natural for them to report having some difficulty learning to work at the pace expected of college students, in Chinese as in their other courses.

To provide a collegiate viewpoint, we also interviewed a number of college professors and queried them about areas in which they felt high school Chinese language instruction could be improved. Most of them mentioned that they increasingly encountered students having high school training in Chinese. For the most part, the professors reported that the high school Chinese instruction was adequate but not spectacular. However, all of them reported that graduates of high school programs arrived with poor backgrounds in reading and writing. They felt that the students' comprehension and speaking skills were somewhat better than their reading and writing skills. Their control of tones was generally suitable, but much more work was needed to bring the students to a point where they had firmer control of Chinese linguistic structures. When asked about the areas they wished high school teachers would emphasize more, most of the professors stressed tones and grammatical structures, with the key being "active control" of tones and structure, as one individual put it. The professors also recognized that some Chinese language programs produced uniformly good students, while others produced weaker ones.

It seems clear from these data that a more comfortable fit between high school and college Chinese pedagogy might be readily achieved. Efforts should surely be made to develop a consensus curriculum and an agreed-upon set of teaching materials that would better prepare high school students for college-level programs.

Expected Length of Study of College Chinese

Problems of articulation aside, how much Chinese do the 60.5 percent of alumni who continue taking Chinese in college expect to complete? Table 6.13 describes their plans.

Table 6.13: Length of College Study Planned by Those Taking Chinese

Number of Years	Percent of Students
One year	11.7
Two years	16.7
Three years	13.3
Four years	26.7
Major in Chinese	15.8
Graduate school	15.8

Source: College student questionnaire.

These students plan to spend a substantial amount of time on Chinese in college. There seems to be a clear realization that learning Chinese takes time, and the students intend to invest that time. A question desperately in need of an answer, however, is how much competency in Chinese even the maximum expenditure of time in college will produce.

Other Courses on China

Not only do these students continue to study the Chinese language in college; almost half of them (49.8 percent) take other courses related to China as well. Only 10.6 percent of the students expect to take a course in which their Chinese language skills will be used at all. One of the great tragedies of higher education is that there is so little opportunity for students to utilize their hard-won skills in substantive courses. The same situation obtains in Chinese. The difficult orthography offers a partial explanation as to why students have so few opportunities to use their Chinese language skills in other coursework, but it is still a shame that they so rarely get the chance.

Actual Majors

In the previous section the plans of the high school students were examined to determine the eventual context in which they might employ their Chinese. It was found that most students who enrolled in Chinese in high school did so for noninstrumental reasons. Moreover, it was too early for many of them to have concrete plans about what they would specialize in at the college level or what their career trajectories might be. However, a very large proportion of the students believed that when they got to college they would major in one of the applied or professional fields, and their career goals lay in these areas as well. How do things look from the college perspective? Did the choice of majors among the program alumni who went on to college approximate what the high school students thought they might choose?

While most high school students expected to major in an applied or professional discipline, the college student majors turned out to be more heavily concentrated in the social sciences (33.5 percent, compared with the 16.6 percent projected by the high school students) and the humanities (27.5 percent, compared with 23.6 percent). Less well represented were the natural sciences (6.5 percent, compared with the 15.4 percent projected by the high school students) and the applied and professional disciplines (19.0 percent, compared with 44.4 percent).

Several of the professional careers that the Chinese language students expected to follow, such as law and medicine, begin their training in graduate school and so would not show up in a review of undergraduate majors. However, business is taught at the undergraduate level, and only 8.5 percent of the students were majoring in business in college, compared with a projected 16.6 percent of high school students. Again, only 5.5 percent were engineering majors in college, while 8.0 percent of the high school students had intended to study engineering. More college students went on to major in Chinese (9.0 percent, compared with the 4.3 percent projected by the high school students). And if East Asian studies (7.5 percent of the college students) and international affairs (7.0 percent) are added to Chinese, fully 23.5 percent are engaged in internationally oriented majors that may be directly relevant to their Chinese training.

Career Plans of College Students

Do the college students have the same career aspirations as the high school students? Table 6.14 compares the plans of the two sets of students. Again, the percentages do not total 100 percent because it was the distribution of career choices that was of interest, rather than the distribution of students. Students were asked to indicate two possible career trajectories they might follow.

Table 6.14: Career Choices of High School and College Students (percent)

Career Choice	High School Students	College Students
Business	35.5	36.1
Chinese-related Ph.D.	4.3	6.8
Education	9.5	9.8
Engineering	17.8	7.3
Health professions	13.9	6.3
International affairs	15.2	22.0
Law	11.6	14.6
Scientific research	10.3	4.4
Other	16.6	17.5
Undecided	9.9	9.3

Source: High school student questionnaire and college student questionnaire.

The career interests of the two sets of students are remarkably close. As might be expected, however, while the high school students optimistically saw themselves pursuing careers in engineering, scientific research, or the health professions, the college students' career choices reflected the distribution of their majors; careers in the biological and natural sciences that require a great deal of undergraduate training are less well represented among the college students, while careers in international affairs have grown more appealing.

One question of interest concerned the college students' expectations of using Chinese in their careers. This question is addressed in Tables 6.15 and 6.16. Table 6.15 indicates, for each career choice, the percentage of students who expect to use, expect not to use, or might use their Chinese professionally. Table 6.16 shows the distribution of careers chosen by students who expect to use their Chinese professionally; the percentages sum to more than 100 percent because the distribution is based on the two possible career choices, and not on the total number of students or the total number of career choices.

Table 6.15: College Students' Expectations of Using Their Chinese Professionally, by Career (percent)

Career	Yes	No	Maybe
Business	65.8	16.0	8.2
Chinese-related Ph.D.	100.0	0.0	0.0
Education	55.0	35.0	10.0
Engineering	40.0	53.3	6.7
Health professions	50.0	41.7	8.3
International affairs	75.6	20.0	4.4
Law	50.0	40.0	10.0
Scientific research	62.5	37.5	0.0
Other	55.6	41.7	2.7
Undecided	27.8	27.8	44.4

Source: College student questionnaire.

Table 6.16: Percentage of College Students Expecting to Use Their Chinese Professionally, by Career

Career	Percent
Business	36.3
Chinese-related Ph.D.	7.0
Education	10.0
Engineering	7.5
Health professions	6.0
International affairs	22.4
Law	14.9
Scientific research	4.0
Other	17.9
Undecided	9.0

Source: College student questionnaire.

Except for prospective engineers, at least half of the students in each career category fully expect to use Chinese in their profession. There are a few surprises: 35.0 percent of the students intending to go into education do not expect to use their Chinese, while 50.0 percent of those going into health professions and 62.5 percent of those going into scientific research seem fairly sure that they will use their Chinese. This high expectation occurs despite the evidence for very low occupational use of school-learned foreign languages.[5] An examination of graduates of internationally oriented MBA programs indicates that among graduates of programs mixing high-level foreign language skills with business education, only about half report using those skills on the job.[6]

It would be of great interest to follow the graduates of both the high school and college Chinese programs to see whether their expectations of career use of Chinese are actually borne out. The existence of such skills in the workplace may in fact create a demand and patterns of utilization. Until we have fresh empirical data, however, teachers and counselors should be careful not to raise expectations of future use of the language too high, particularly at the levels of competency most students can achieve in high school and college. On the other hand, given students' overwhelming desire to use their Chinese language skills in a future career, greater attention should be paid to pointing instruction toward students' career orientations, particularly in the upper-level courses offered in colleges and universities.

Summary

The students in these programs are a dedicated group. They have often taken other languages before. While they initially enroll in Chinese for general intellectual reasons, most of them continue to study the language as long as they can. Unfortunately, limitations on how early they can start Chinese and on how many levels the school offers mean that most of them can complete only one or two years of instruction at the high school level. When they go on to college, a majority of them continue with their Chinese, although they are often put back to a beginning level. Most students choose their majors or formulate their career objectives with the expectation that they will actually use their Chinese. It will be interesting to see how many reach what level of competency over their entire educational careers and whether they truly will use Chinese in either their coursework or their future occupations. Putting the whole student's Chinese learning career together, making it cumulative to a genuinely useful level, providing opportunities for real-life use of skills—these are major challenges facing the Chinese language teaching profession.

---

[5] See ibid.

[6] Richard D. Lambert, "Foreign Language Use among International Business Graduates," in ibid., pp. 47–59.

The final chapter summarizes the principal findings of this survey and presents several policy recommendations.

Chapter Seven

Summary and Recommendations

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part summarizes the individual substantive findings of the survey. The second part presents some broad conclusions and recommendations for future action drawn from a review of the survey.

Substantive Findings

The goal of the Dodge Chinese Initiative was to introduce and firmly anchor Chinese instruction in American high schools. The Dodge intervention strategy included the following features:

- spreading funding (normally two payments of $20,000 each) broadly across the country to a substantial number of high schools (sixty in all);
- maximizing chances for success and possible emulation by selecting public and private schools with a record of high academic achievement;
- insisting on a formal statement of commitment to Chinese language instruction, on an action plan worked out in collaboration with nearby college-level Chinese specialists, and on frequent interaction with Dodge staff;
- supporting the development of a new Chinese text written by university professors for high school use;
- organizing summer workshops for teacher training and professional development; and
- importing native speakers from China as short-term curricular consultants in some schools.

Most of the Dodge funds (71.7 percent) were distributed to individual schools. The schools devoted the bulk of those funds (71.0 percent) to teachers' salaries.

Questionnaire data were collected from 43 principals and 48 teachers from the Dodge-funded schools; 1,783 students enrolled in the programs; principals of 138 schools teaching Chinese that were not funded by Dodge; a control group of 657 students enrolled in French, German, Spanish, and Latin classes; 211 recent graduates of high school Chinese programs currently enrolled in college; and 12 college-level teachers having considerable experience with students who had started Chinese in high school. In addition to the questionnaire surveys, site visits were conducted at twenty-five Dodge-funded high schools and four teacher training workshops.

Schools and Programs

The goals of promoting the durability of the programs and diffusing the model to other non-Dodge schools were only partially achieved. Only 51 percent of the principals reported that the continuation of the programs would be secure for five more years. Of the sixty schools supported in the Dodge Chinese Initiative, fifteen had dropped their Chinese language instruction by 1991. The major causes of the discontinuation of programs were declining enrollments, teacher or administrator turnover, budgetary cuts, or the introduction of instruction in Japanese. There was little evidence that the success of any program had led to a diffusion of Chinese instruction into other schools.

By high school standards, most of the programs were relatively small. Total enrollments in the Dodge programs averaged approximately forty students, compared with average total enrollments of approximately four hundred in Spanish and three hundred in French in the same schools.

To assure the continuation of the program, teachers have to spend a great deal of time on student recruitment. They often have to overcome such handicaps as regulations limiting enrollment to upper-level students, to those who have completed other language courses, or to those having a high grade point average.

Support for the programs is strongest among principals and, with notable exceptions, among other language teachers. It is weakest among the guidance counselors and nonlanguage faculty of the schools. Parental support is strong but largely confined to nonacademic matters.

In addition to Chinese language courses, most schools (74.4 percent) offer substantive courses on China as well.

Teachers

The teachers of high school Chinese are somewhat older on the average than most high school teachers, they are overwhelmingly (75 percent) female, and they are preponderantly (75 percent) of Chinese origin.

In the view of the principals, the students, the teachers themselves, and the site-visit teams, the success of a program depends most heavily on the skill and enthusiasm of the teacher. Another major indicator of the success of a program is the degree of the teacher's professionalization. The overall picture here is one of progress made but with a fair distance yet to travel. Most of the teachers have graduate degrees. A full 73 percent have a master's degree and 28 percent a Ph.D. Half of them have a degree in education. While 60 percent of the teachers reported having had specific training in language teaching methodology, much of this took place at the Dodge-sponsored teacher workshops. Teaching certificates are held by 68 percent of those teaching in public schools, but by fewer than one-third of those teaching in private schools. Many of these certificates are temporary and must be made permanent at a future date. Moreover, very few teachers are certified specifically to teach Chinese. The teaching certificate is normally for language instruction generally or for another subject entirely.

Two-thirds of the teachers are teaching full-time, but less than one-fourth have permanent positions. The sudden increase in demand for Chinese language instruction drew in many teachers with limited high school teaching experience. The mean number of years of high school teaching experience they had at the time of the survey was less than five, and 27 percent had taught for less than two. Most of this experience was gained in their current position. Only about one-third (37 percent) had taught in high school prior to attaining their current position.

Native-speaker Chinese are assumed to have full competency in the language. For all but 11 percent of them their mother tongue is Mandarin, and the others speak Mandarin fluently. The problem of the native speaker is not command of the language or familiarity with Chinese culture, but knowledge of American culture, particularly the special subculture of the American high school. Most of the Chinese-speaking teachers came to the United States after completing a bachelor's degree in either the People's Republic of China or Taiwan. For many, learning to cope in an American high school environment poses a special challenge.

English-speaking teachers must acquire their Chinese cultural and linguistic knowledge as a second skill. Sixty-three percent of the English-speaking teachers majored or minored in Chinese studies in college. While very few English-speaking teachers have taken an objective test to measure their language competency, most (69 percent) self-rated their speaking and listening competencies at near-native level. However, a continuing problem for English speakers is the upgrading and maintenance of language skills.

Only 45 percent of high school Chinese teachers restrict their teaching solely to the Chinese language. Most teach a second subject. Slightly over one-third of them (35 percent) are required to teach another language, and slightly under one-third (31 percent) teach a substantive course on China or on Asia more generally.

The Content of Instruction

In high school, teaching Chinese means teaching Mandarin. Cantonese is rarely taught, and other Chinese languages are not taught at all. There is a lack of consensus among teachers on what the ideal curriculum should be; on which skills should be emphasized; on the choice of phonetic transcription systems; on the type and number of characters that students should learn; on the selection and timing of specific linguistic patterns to be taught; and on the proper emphasis on and way of teaching Chinese culture.

In spite of the many special difficulties of arranging for student visits to China, three-fourths of the teachers report that some of their students have traveled to China, and one-half indicate that their school has a continuing arrangement to facilitate such visits.

Teaching Practices and Resources

The teachers report that Chinese is used in the classroom for about 50 percent of the time in level 1 courses and for 80 percent of the time in level 4/5 courses. Classroom observation indicates that this may often be an overestimation. Homework time is in the main devoted to mastering the writing system and to memorizing vocabulary.

Chinese teachers believe that the special difficulty of learning the language, the paucity of off-the-shelf teaching materials, and the number of levels each teacher must teach place an unusually heavy workload on them. Moreover, the special demands of providing cultural context and of motivating students are reported by the teachers to be very time-consuming. However, other members of the language faculty believe that the small class size and the uniformly high motivation of students in Chinese classes mean that teachers of Chinese have an easier workload than teachers of Western European languages.

Student accomplishment is still almost exclusively measured by the number of courses taken and the grades received. Examinations are primarily achievement tests constructed by teachers on an ad hoc basis and reflecting specifically what was taught in the lessons. There is little evidence of the use of any nationally normed tests.

Contrary to expectations, grade inflation does not appear to be a major problem. The distribution of student grades was about average for high school courses, and students received about the same grades they were given in other courses.

The textbook prepared specifically for the project was the one most widely adopted in the Dodge-supported programs. It was used by 63 percent of the teachers. While they judge the Dodge-sponsored text to be generally satisfactory, many of them question its suitability for use in high school classrooms. In practice, when the Dodge-sponsored textbook is used in the classroom, it is frequently supplemented by other materials. Eight other textbooks are also in common use.

Students

Most of the students (68 percent) are in public schools, but public versus private school affiliation made almost no difference in student attitudes or behavior. Gender differences had only an occasional effect, although it was found that unlike students in most other foreign language classes, the majority of students in the Dodge programs (57 percent) are male.

One-third of the students in the sample come from families where Chinese is spoken, but for more than half of these students (57 percent) the home language is Cantonese or another language other than Mandarin. As a result, teachers encounter great variation in the amount and type of language background students bring to the classroom. The heterogeneity of the student body is a common complaint among teachers. Low enrollments and low average class sizes make it impossible to segregate the different kinds of students. The presence of substantial numbers of ethnic Chinese students requires special teaching materials and strategies, raises questions of grading equivalences, and complicates the task of motivating the non-Chinese-origin students.

Most students (79 percent) had had instruction in another foreign language before studying Chinese. Taking Chinese is always an optional decision, one that requires special motivation on the part of students. These students chose to study Chinese primarily for noninstrumental, intellectual reasons. About half of them cited one or another instrumental reason for studying Chinese as well, although these reasons received less emphasis than the intellectual ones. In particular, many students believed that studying Chinese would improve their chances of admission to a high-ranking college and would eventually be useful in a career. Parental pressure was reported to be of less importance—although it figured more prominently in the motivations of ethnic Chinese students—and the role of friends or acquaintances seemed to be only a marginal factor in the motivation to study Chinese.

Student enrollments are heavily concentrated (76 percent) in the first two levels of Chinese, with almost half (48 percent) in the first level. Conversely, only 24 percent of the students are enrolled in upper-level courses. Only 16 percent complete three years of study of Chinese, and only 9 percent get a full four years of instruction. Two structural features of high school Chinese instruction contribute to this situation. First, many schools prohibit or discourage lowerclassmen from taking Chinese. Hence, recruitment into the introductory level continues throughout the various high school classes; 38 percent of students in level 1 are juniors or seniors. Students therefore graduate before they can complete very many levels of Chinese. While about two-thirds of the schools (67.5 percent) actually offer instruction beyond the second year, the fact that many students do not begin the study of Chinese until their junior year means that few can complete a full three- or four-year sequence. The evidence is that if they were able to do so, many more students would take four years of Chinese in high school. Estimations of continuation rates correcting for late starts and truncated programs show a surprisingly high degree of determination to study as much Chinese as possible: 84 percent of those completing level 1 go on to level 2; 85 percent of those completing level 2 go on to level 3; and 80 percent of those completing level 3 go on to level 4. Clearly, the constraints that limit the amount of Chinese instruction that most high school enrollees receive are primarily structural, not motivational. This is in striking contrast to the high voluntary attrition rates in the Western European languages—50 percent losses from level to level—where students typically start their study of the language as freshmen and where almost all schools offer four full years of instruction.

Almost all of the students (97 percent) enrolled in high school Chinese expect to go on to college. They select a wide range of colleges—309 in all—but more than three-fourths intend to go to colleges that are ranked as very competitive or higher.

Almost half of the students (44 percent) intend to major in an applied or professional discipline when they go to college. Business is selected most frequently (by 17 percent of the students), and relatively few (4 percent) intend to major in Chinese. A full 70 percent of the students say that they intend to take more Chinese in college, and this intention is strong regardless of the intended major.

The career most frequently aspired to, by 36 percent of the students, is business. More than three-fourths (77 percent) expect to go into business, education, engineering, or medicine. Only 10 percent plan to be teachers. In spite of this heavy emphasis on applied and professional career objectives, 60 percent of the students believe they will use Chinese in their future careers.

Data from a survey of Dodge program graduates who had gone on to college indicated that 65 percent of these students had taken additional Chinese language courses in college.

Almost half of them (43 percent) were placed in the first term of college courses, and two-thirds (66 percent) were placed in the first year.

Only 21 percent of the students who continue with Chinese in college report having major difficulties in moving from the high school to the college classroom. College professors were more likely to report difficulties, noting that graduates of high school Chinese programs were often deficient in their ability to read and write characters, in their use of tones, and in their command of grammatical structures.

Of the college students who had studied Chinese in high school, 16 percent intend to major in Chinese, and another 16 percent intend to continue with Chinese beyond college into graduate school. Of the remainder, 40 percent intend to take more than two years of Chinese in college, and as many as 27 percent intend to take a full four years of Chinese. However, only 10 percent expect to take a substantive course in which they will be able to use their Chinese.

The actual majors of the high school program alumni enrolled in college were more heavily concentrated in the social sciences (34 percent) and the humanities (27 percent) than had been anticipated. Only 19 percent majored in one of the applied or professional fields, compared with the 44 percent of the high school students who intended to do so. Only 9 percent were enrolled as undergraduate business majors.

Career goals had shifted as well. Many (36 percent) still intended to be employed in business, but engineering and the health professions had dropped considerably in popularity (to 7 percent and 6 percent, respectively). The study of Chinese in high school had encouraged a surprising number of students (22 percent) to seek careers in international affairs. Most of the college students surveyed (61 percent) indicated that they expected to use Chinese in their future careers, whatever the career might be. Given the current American tendency toward low occupational use of foreign languages, such expectations are probably unrealistic.

Recommendations

Looking back on the results of the survey as a whole, what recommendations can be made for language policymakers, school administrators, and funders?

Specific Aspects of the Dodge Program That Merit Emulation

Successful interventions must address a number of different aspects of language programs, they must be sustained for a number of years, and they must balance local initiative and central direction. Some of the success of the Dodge Chinese Initiative derived from the fact that it intervened at a number of different levels and in a series of interlocking ways to promote the growth of Chinese language instruction in high schools. The following list indicates some of the aspects of the program that had the greatest impact.

1. Dodge insisted on evidence of strong administrative backing, both within the school itself and at the district and state levels. The enthusiasm of the principal was a key

criterion in the selection process, and the support of the principal turned out to be a key factor in whether or not the program was continued after the period of initial support was completed.

2. Dodge dealt with a substantial number of schools rather than choosing one or two pilot projects in the hope that their example would be copied.

3. Dodge distributed most of the funds directly to the schools rather than to some centralized organization whose impact on individual schools would have been weak and indirect. However, one of the important Dodge investments was at the national level—the summer teacher training workshops. These workshops made a major contribution to the professionalization of the teachers as well as promoting the development of an organized, self-conscious national-level planning structure.

4. The investment in developing curricular consensus and reform through the commissioning of a new textbook was sensible, but the long-term success of such a strategy requires a more deliberate feedback mechanism between the teachers in the individual classrooms and the centrally appointed author of the text materials. Fortunately, a curricular planning group of teachers has emerged that may provide that interchange.

5. Dodge invested modestly in tying language learning to overseas experience by bringing teachers directly from the mainland to serve as curricular consultants and, more recently, by sponsoring teacher travel to China. Funding decisions always represent trade-offs between various desirable goals, but future policy should face much more directly the relationship of overseas to domestic language learning for all concerned, including the students.

6. Funding was spaced over a number of years, and its continuation depended on evidence of satisfactory performance. The Dodge Foundation staff, occasionally assisted by outside experts, dealt continuously and constructively with the individual schools and with successive summer workshops. Too often funders pour money in at the beginning of isolated projects without any mechanism for assisting in the development process or for making the scattered efforts cumulative and mutually supportive. Dodge stayed with its Chinese Initiative for a substantial period of time. The evidence of turnover in these programs indicates that an even longer commitment is required. Special attention must be paid to key transition points such as the change of teachers or the introduction of a competitive new language into the same school.

More General Policy Issues Raised

There were a number of issues raised by the survey that relate not strictly to the Dodge Initiative but more generally to the introduction of Chinese into the high school curriculum.

1. Chinese language instruction at the high school level must be viewed as part of a larger system. From the perspective of the student, high school instruction is part of a longer-term language-learning career. From the perspective of the school, the curriculum and teaching style at the high school level should be articulated with those at the college level—and, increasingly, at the middle and elementary school levels. In addition, domestic language training should be complemented by a carefully articulated overseas experience for those students most likely to continue on to high levels of skill in Chinese.

2. Productive teaching and learning styles at the high school level have special features that require a deliberate tailoring of the instructional process for that level. Hence, the preparation of materials, course syllabi, and teacher training should involve teachers with experience in teaching Chinese at that level; general specialists on the Chinese language; and perhaps most important, the forgotten resource in most efforts to develop the less commonly taught languages at the precollegiate level—foreign language specialists and teacher trainers from schools of education.

3. The high proportion of students in the classrooms who are exposed to different varieties and amounts of Chinese at home demands the development of special materials and instructional strategies tailored to their needs. It also suggests the articulation of instruction in high schools with teaching practices in the "Saturday schools" that serve as language reinforcement centers for Chinese-origin students.

4. In view of the small number of teachers currently engaged in high school Chinese instruction, a national teacher training and credentialing system should be developed in collaboration with one or more schools of education. It should be uniform across states, and it should provide a standard for teacher competency in Chinese and in general pedagogical practice as well as in the unique demands of teaching Chinese (such as teaching the sound system, introducing and teaching the writing system, and providing cultural context in conjunction with linguistic instruction).

5. The widely scattered Chinese language programs badly need a set of commonly calibrated tests to be used for placing students at the outset of instruction, for measuring their competency at the end of training, and for providing feedback to students and teachers as they work to improve the learning process.

6. The national Chinese language teachers' organizations at the high school level have a special role in the professionalization of individual teachers and in the development of common curricula. These organizations are therefore special candidates for support at this stage of development of the field.

7. The intent of the Dodge Chinese Initiative was to foster the development of one of the less commonly taught languages, Chinese, in high schools. However laudable this specific objective, it illustrates the basic lack of any policy or even criteria for judgment on the more general questions about which foreign languages should be offered in how

many and which high schools, and how many and what kinds of students should be encouraged to take them. In the absence of such overall policy decisions, each foreign language is left on its own to compete in the marketplace. As the data in the survey show, this competitive framework is not a level playing field for the non–Western European languages. In spite of major efforts such as those of the Dodge Foundation, the non–Western European languages still capture only a tiny fraction of high school enrollments; the expansion in Russian enrollments threatens German, Chinese threatens Russian, and Japanese threatens them all. Successfully introducing the less commonly taught languages into high schools is exceedingly difficult, given the institutional rigidities of high schools generally and the deadweight of past language-choice policy. The Dodge Chinese Initiative makes it clear that if expansion of instruction in the less commonly taught languages is to be achieved, it will have to be deliberately sought and nourished. And the balance among languages should not be left to swings of national enthusiasm (as in the case of the current boom in Japanese instruction) or to the accident of particular government or foundation programs (as in the case of the Russian high school student exchange program or the Dodge Chinese Initiative). The results of this survey emphasize in a very direct fashion the need for more deliberate decisions about which languages we should teach and learn.

Appendix A

The Difficulty of Chinese

Chinese has long had a reputation for being difficult for English speakers to master. There is no doubt that Chinese is more difficult for English speakers than the commonly taught languages of Western Europe are, but just how much more difficult--and why—is a more complex issue. The difficulty issue is particularly important with regard to teaching Mandarin in American high schools. Students may avoid studying Mandarin because of its tough reputation, and teachers may insist on an instructional approach quite distinct from that of the European languages.

Moreover, the difficulty issue has much to do with educational policy issues: learners should start earlier in the educational system, learning should not be disrupted year to year across courses, and the shift from elementary to middle school to high school to college should be more carefully articulated than is the case with the comparatively easier Western European languages. Graduate schools of education may need to require additional training time and courses for teachers of Chinese. Certification standards may need to be made more stringent. Perhaps the teachers of hard languages should be more highly paid, both as a reward and as a recruitment incentive.

In short, the difficulty issue permeates almost every facet of the study of Mandarin, from learners' and teachers' expectations to teacher training, curriculum design, resource allocation, and a whole range of educational policy issues. Thus, a closer look at what makes Mandarin a "hard" language may be useful as background to understanding this survey and its results.

The most widely used measure of the difficulty of foreign languages was developed by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI)—the government training program for diplomatic personnel. This scale measures the difficulty a native English speaker experiences in studying one of the many languages traditionally taught at the FSI. Difficulty is defined on the basis of the number of instructional contact hours required to reach standard levels of proficiency. Proficiency is rated on a six-point scale ranging from 0 (no functional proficiency) to 5 (the proficiency of an educated native speaker). The FSI estimates that the time required for a student of average language-learning aptitude to reach a proficiency level of 2 in a language such as French is 480 contact hours. For the same type of student to reach the same level in Mandarin, the estimated time is 1,320 hours, almost triple the time required for French. By studying the number of instructional contact hours required to reach a given level of proficiency in a number of languages, the FSI has divided the languages it teaches into four categories of difficulty. Category 1 includes the languages that are easiest for a native English speaker to learn: French, German, and Spanish. Category 4, the most difficult languages, includes only Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

Given this scheme, it would indeed appear that Mandarin Chinese is quite difficult compared with the languages commonly taught in American high schools. But what makes the Category 4 languages so hard? The usual answer is that they have complex, nonalphabetic writing systems. This complexity affects the study of the language in two ways: the writing system itself takes longer to master than the writing systems of Category 1–3 languages do; and mastery of reading and writing takes so much time away from study of the oral language that the entire learning process is slowed significantly.

Is it only the writing system that makes Mandarin such a difficult language? DeFrancis has this to say:

> Overall, for a native speaker of English, learning to speak Chinese is not much more difficult than learning to speak French. It is in the traditional writing system that the greatest difficulty is encountered. The blanket designation of "Chinese" as a hard language is a myth generated by the failure to distinguish between speech and writing. Perhaps we can put things in perspective by suggesting, to make a rough guesstimate, that learning to speak Chinese is about 5 percent more difficult than learning to speak French, whereas learning to read Chinese is about five times as hard as learning to read French.[1]

This characterization of the difficulty of Mandarin raises a number of educational policy questions. Would high schools be better advised to concentrate on the spoken language and ignore the writing system? Would students be more likely to take Chinese if the word went out that spoken Mandarin was only 5 percent more difficult than spoken French? Would study of the spoken language proceed more rapidly if it were not pulled down by the time-consuming work of learning the written language? Many students are attracted to the study of Chinese precisely because of its exotic writing system; would ignoring the writing system discourage their interest? Moreover, as the survey indicates, many (most?) high school Chinese programs are based on the hope that students with a substantial amount of high school training can avoid repeating elementary Chinese at the college level. However, students with no or little training in the writing system at the high school level would never place out of elementary college instruction in the language. Does the difficulty of the writing system suggest that the more proper goal of high school study is the spoken language, and that students should still be expected to enroll in elementary Chinese college programs and there begin their study of the written language? Obviously, these issues are still being faced as Chinese enters the high school scene.

Even with regard to the spoken language, the difficulty of learning Mandarin is somewhat more complex than DeFrancis's description suggests. Understanding the difficulty issue depends to a certain extent on what we mean by "learning the spoken language." To many Chinese language educators, "learning spoken Mandarin" apparently means learning the linguistic, structural features of the language—the sound system, vocabulary, and grammatical structures. DeFrancis's characterization suggests exactly this view of learning. But if the goal of learning the spoken language is not just to master the linguistic system but to use that system for intercultural communication, then the issue of difficulty becomes much more complex.

---

[1] John DeFrancis, *The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984), p. 52.

Note that DeFrancis does not mention culture or transcultural communication at all. Yet for the student of Chinese who wants to use the language for communication, cultural differences between native English and native Chinese speakers influence every utterance that is exchanged. Mastery of linguistic structure is necessary for communication to take place, but in and of itself it is insufficient; the cultural element must also be mastered.

Much has been said over the years about the ease of mastering a cognate language (cognate to one's native language) and the difficulty of mastering a noncognate one; but the notion of cognate and noncognate *cultures* is strikingly absent from such discussions. The native English-speaking high school student in the United States is clearly in a better position to deal with the cognate cultures of Western Europe than with the noncognate cultures of East Asia. Western European cultural, political, moral, religious, and legal traditions are unconsciously embedded in the minds of most Americans, and they are made quite explicit in the American educational curriculum. As a consequence, high school students learning French, German, or Spanish may feel that they are learning a *foreign* language and culture, but in reality they are only learning a *cognate* language and culture.

Learning to communicate interpersonally with native Chinese speakers is an endeavor of enormous complexity, and one that seems not to have been addressed in the American instructional system. To communicate effectively with native Chinese speakers, one cannot simply take the communication norms of English and plug in the Chinese linguistic code. For face-to-face communication, the native English-speaking American must learn to think differently, to say things differently, to act differently—no small undertaking.

DeFrancis's characterization of the ease of learning spoken Mandarin is perhaps greatly oversimplified. But what of the difficulty of the written language? Again, DeFrancis's suggestion that learning to read Chinese is five times more difficult than learning to read French may likewise turn out to be optimistic when culture—a truly foreign culture, not a cognate culture—enters the picture. This characterization of reading difficulty is most likely based on a linguistic assessment of difficulty. But in reality, it is not just the reading of Chinese that is problematic, but also the comprehension of what one has read. In fact, both listening and reading must be redefined as activities requiring intercultural interpretation. Whether we consider written texts or other artifacts created by native Chinese speakers—movies, plays, traditional operas, television soap operas, radio and television commercials—the challenge is to interpret the meaning, and it is the culture that ultimately confers that meaning.

To interpret interculturally what one reads or listens to requires a comprehensive knowledge of the culture itself. At least three avenues to gaining the knowledge required for dealing with non-Western cultures and their linguistic artifacts have emerged in American educational settings: (1) study of the culture and country (e.g., history, political structure, literature, geography, religion, anthropology) using English language sources or in courses conducted in English; (2) study of the same sort of material but using original, Chinese language sources; and (3) direct contact with the living culture through study abroad. These three features of education in noncognate culture are no doubt most developed in the area studies programs that provide training for graduate students in a number of

American universities. While these programs are intended to train future China scholars, the three components are nevertheless assumed by most Chinese language educators as being necessary, not optional, for effective education in face-to-face intercultural communication and interpretation.

If these three educational components are truly necessary, then "learning to speak Chinese" and "learning to read Chinese" are not really the whole story about the difficulty of the language. Including these three additional components requires even more time, even more training, than just mastering the linguistic system and the writing system would suggest.

Is learning Chinese, either the spoken language or the written language, difficult or not? If we leave cultural knowledge out of the picture, then DeFrancis's characterization is probably fairly accurate. If we include the cultural dimension, redefining the purpose of study from *language learning* to *mastery of intercultural communication* (both interpersonal and interpretative), then his characterization is misleading. If intercultural communication is the educational goal, then the "myth" that Chinese—and for that matter any non-European language—is difficult for native English speakers is probably one of the truer myths around.

Appendix B

States with Teacher Training Programs in Chinese

State	College or University
Alaska	University of Alaska–Fairbanks
Florida	University of Florida
Hawaii	University of Hawaii–Manoa
Indiana	Ball State University
	Indiana University
Iowa	University of Iowa
Kansas	University of Kansas–Lawrence
Louisiana	"No university in Louisiana offers a teacher training program specifically in these areas. However, the Department of Education will certify individuals who complete all professional education and foreign language course requirements (36 semester hours of a single foreign language are required for certification in that language)."
Minnesota	University of Minnesota–Twin Cities
New Hampshire	Dartmouth College
	Franklin Pierce College
North Carolina	"Field based; an irregular route; can get a permanent certificate after a period of classroom observation"
Ohio	Ohio State University
	"Technically speaking, we don't have any programs approved in these languages. The Department of Education will certify persons who have the required number of course credits in the language or demonstrate an equivalent level of proficiency and who meet other certification requirements."
Oregon	"Several institutions offer these languages but don't have approved teacher training programs."
South Carolina	University of South Carolina–Columbia (possibly)
Utah	Brigham Young University

State	College or University
Washington	Pacific Lutheran University
	University of Puget Sound
	University of Washington
	Washington State University
	Western Washington University
Wisconsin	University of Wisconsin–Madison

Source: Survey of foreign language supervisors conducted by the National Foreign Language Center in the spring and fall of 1991.

Appendix C

Public and Private High School Enrollments in Chinese in 1991

The following tables provide information on high schools offering Chinese language programs. The data have been compiled from the National Foreign Language Center's survey in 1991 of the non-Dodge schools teaching Chinese and the Secondary School Chinese Language Center's survey of enrollments in the Dodge schools as reflected in the spring of 1991.

Table C.1 lists the schools by state, indicating whether the school is public, private, or parochial, and providing information on how many levels of Chinese are taught in each school. Enrollment data are not given for individual schools; instead, levels for which a school has enrollments are indicated by an X. There are some schools that are known to have active Chinese language programs but have not provided enrollment data. Those active programs are indicated by NA. A few schools show enrollments in levels 2 through 4 or 5, but no enrollments at lower levels. It can be assumed that those are schools that are phasing out the Chinese language program—allowing students already enrolled to complete the sequence, but not admitting new enrollees.

Table C.2 gives total enrollments in high school Chinese for each state.

Table C.1: Schools Teaching Chinese in 1990–91, by Level and State

State	School	School Type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Alabama	Murphy HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
Alaska	Mount Edgecumbe HS	Pub.	X				
	Service HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
California	Alhambra HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	C. K. McClatchy HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Clovis Unified	Pub.	X	X			
	Duncan Polytechnical HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Galileo HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	

State	School	School Type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
California *(cont.)*	George Washington HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Long Beach Polytechnic HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Lowell HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Marlboro School	Pvt.		X			
	Mission HS	Pub.	X				
	Oakland HS	Pub.				X	
	Philip Burton HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Robert Louis Stevenson HS	Pvt.	X	X			
	St. Mary's HS	Par.	NA				
	San Gabriel HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Sweetwater Union HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	University HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X
	Woodside International	Pvt.	X	X	X		
Colorado	Cherry Creek HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
Connecticut	Conard HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Hillhouse HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Kingswood-Oxford HS	Pvt.				X	
	Taft School	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	
	Westport Public School	Pub.	X				
	William H. Hall HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
Florida	Nova HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	St. Andrew's School	Pvt.	X	X	X		
Hawaii	Iolani HS	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	X
	Kalani HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Kamehameha School	Pvt.	X	X			
	McKinley Senior HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Maryknoll HS	Par.	X	X	X	X	X
	Punahou School	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	X

Public and Private High School Enrollments in Chinese in 1991

State	School	School Type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Illinois	Lakeview HS	Pub.	X	X			
Indiana	Arsenal Tech. HS	Pub.			X	X	X
	Carmel HS	Pub.	X				
	Jennings County HS	Pub.	X				
	New Albany HS	Pub.	NA *				
	Perry Meridian HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Portage HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Shortridge Junior HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Southport HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Indianapolis Pub. School	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	North Central HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
Kansas	Highland Park HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Topeka HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
Kentucky	Atherton HS	Pub.	X	X			
Louisiana	Isidore Newman	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	
Maine	Deering HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Portland HS	Pub.	X				
Maryland	Baltimore Polytechnic	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Bethesda-Chevy Chase HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Blair HS	Pub.		X			
	Bryn Mawr School	Pvt.	X				
	Julius West Middle School	Pub.	X				
	Richard Montgomery HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X
	Rockville HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Roland Park Country School	Pvt.	X				
	Walter Johnson HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Western HS	Pub.	X	X	X		

Public and Private High School Enrollments in Chinese in 1991

State	School	School Type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Massachusetts	Boston Latin School	Pvt.	X	X	X		
	Brookline HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Copley Square HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Cushing Academy	Pvt.	X	X			
	Deerfield Academy	Pvt.		X			
	Milton Academy	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	X †
	Newton North HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Newton South HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Northfield Mount Hermon	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	
	Oakmont Regional HS	Pub.	X				
	Phillips Academy/Andover	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	X †
	Springfield Central HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
Michigan	Seaholm HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
Minnesota	Breck School	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	
	Highland Park HS	Pub.	NA				
	South HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
Missouri	Barstow School	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	X
	St. Louis University HS	Par.	X	X	X	X	
Nebraska	Everett Junior HS	Pub.	X				
	Lincoln HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
New Hampshire	St. Paul's School	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	
	Phillips Exeter Academy	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	
New Jersey	Colonia HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Newark Academy	Pvt.	X	X			
	Ridgewood HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	South Brunswick	Pub.	X	X			
	West Windsor HS	Pub.	X	X	X		

Public and Private High School Enrollments in Chinese in 1991

State	School	School Type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
New York	Albany HS	Pub.	X	X		X	
	Benjamin Cardozo HS	Pub.	NA				
	Bronx HS of Science	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Calasanctius School	Pvt.		X	X		
	Edward R. Murrow HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X
	Fort Hamilton HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Francis Lewis HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Huntington HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	John Dewey HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Longwood HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Monticello HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Newtown HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X
	St. Ann's School	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	X
	Seward Park HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X
	Sheepshead Bay School	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Sun Yat Sen School	Pub.	NA				
North Carolina	Enlo HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
Ohio	Central-Hower HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Columbus Alternative HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Devilbliss HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Mifflin International Middle School	Pub.	NA				
	Orange HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Walnut Hills HS	Pub.	X	X	X		X
	Warren G. Harding HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
Oklahoma	Booker T. Washington HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
Oregon	Madison HS	Pub.	X				
	South Eugene HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X

Public and Private High School Enrollments in Chinese in 1991

State	School	School Type	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Pennsylvania	Downington School District	Pub.	X				
	McDowell Senior HS	Pub.	X				
	Philadelphia HS for Girls	Pub.	X				
	Shady Side Academy	Pvt.	X	X	X		
	Wissahickon HS	Pub.	X		X	X	
Texas	Bellaire Senior HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X
Virginia	Fairfax County Public School	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Madeira School	Pvt.	X	X	X		
	St. Catherine's School	Pvt.	X	X	X		
	Thomas Jefferson HS	Pub.	X	X			
Washington	Capital HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Kamaiakin HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Kennewick HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	Newport HS	Pub.	X	X			X
	Olympia School District	Pub.	X	X	X	X	
	Sammamish HS	Pub.	X	X	X	X	X
Wisconsin	James Madison Memorial HS	Pub.	X	X	X		
	University School of Milwaukee	Pvt.		X	X		
Dist. of Columbia	Banneker Senior HS	Pub.	X	X			
	Sidwell Friends	Pvt.	X	X	X	X	

Note: "Pub." = public; "Pvt." = private; "Par." = parochial.

* Chinese is offered, but no one has signed up for the course.

† Six levels of Chinese are offered.

Source: NFLC survey of non-Dodge schools, and survey of Dodge schools conducted by the Secondary School Chinese Language Center.

Table C.2: Enrollments in High School Chinese, by Level and State, Using Data Reported by Individual Schools

State	Unspecified	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Total
Alabama	—	18	9	6	1	—	34
Alaska	—	20	10	7	—	—	37
California	—	679	426	222	250	18	1,595
Colorado	—	9	19	21	—	—	49
Connecticut	3	21	29	8	4	—	65
Florida	—	17	25	25	—	—	67
Hawaii	—	165	114	88	61	27	455
Illinois	—	5	8	—	—	—	13
Indiana	4	100	47	23	9	4	187
Kansas	—	27	23	15	3	—	68
Kentucky	—	3	2	—	—	—	5
Louisiana	1	13	4	5	—	—	23
Maine	—	21	3	—	—	—	24
Maryland	20	90	67	28	13	2	220
Massachusetts	69	200	107	58	28	6	468
Michigan	—	3	6	10	10	—	29
Minnesota	14	38	44	19	17	—	132
Missouri	—	24	44	19	21	—	108
Nebraska	—	18	17	17	—	—	52
New Hampshire	—	8	17	24	17	—	66
New Jersey	42	30	24	10	9	—	115
New York	9	357	427	488	407	179	1,867
North Carolina	—	1	4	3	—	—	8
Ohio	9	123	76	28	10	—	246
Oklahoma	—	10	15	13	12	—	50
Oregon	—	33	15	3	2	1	54
Pennsylvania	—	60	8	7	4	—	79
Texas	14	16	26	23	16	20	115
Virginia	1	22	18	7	—	—	48
Washington	13	65	74	10	10	17	189
Wisconsin	—	7	19	5	—	—	31
District of Columbia	—	13	15	8	2	—	38
Total enrollments	199	2,216	1,742	1,200	906	274	6,537

Source: NFLC survey of non-Dodge schools, and survey of Dodge schools conducted by the Secondary School Chinese Language Center.

NFLC

The National Foreign Language Center
at the Johns Hopkins University
1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW
Suite 400
Washington DC 20036